

*J. Evans. an. dom. 1693. 4*

A  
DEFENCE  
OF  
Mr. M. H's Brief ENQUIRY  
INTO THE  
NATURE  
OF  
SCHISM

And the Vindication of it.

WITH  
REFLECTIONS  
Upon a Pamphlet called  
The Review, &c.

And a Brief Historical Account of Nonconformity from the Reformation to this Present Time.

*By Mr William Tonge.*

LONDON,

Printed by T. S. for Tho. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns,  
at the Lower End of Cheapside near Mercers Chappel, 1693.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



---

# THE PREFACE.

**I** Expect to hear from all Sides, that such Controversies as these, at this time a day, are very inopportune and ill advised; I confess we have as much reason to value our present Ease and Quiet as any People in the World, and to avoid every thing that may disturb or endanger it: And we have not so abandon'd the Principles of Self-preservation, as willingly to expose our selves to repeated Severities.

And if I had not some Cause to believe that our silent disregard of the Abuses put upon us, will be made (by Innuendo's) a Confession of Guilt, and will harden and encourage our Adversaries against us, I would have took no notice of the Citizen's Reply, but have left him and his Learned Cabal, to the sweet Delights of a fancied Conquest.

I know we may safely appeal, from his sordid Calumnies, to the juster Sentiments of the soberest and wisest of the Episcopal Perswasion, who have been full as severe in the Censure of his Pamphlets, as is necessary for us to be; but I am also assured, there are too many in this emancipated Age, that are passionately fond of any thing that throws dirt upon Dissenters, and true or false, sence or nonsense, it is all one to them; whose insatiable Lusts have left them neither Time nor Capacity to search into the true state and merits of the Cause.

I wonder upon what Inducement, this Gentleman should take upon him to quarrel with Mr. H's Enquiry, unless it were that he might make himself the Favourite of such a Generation of Men; or that his Ghostly Fathers had obliged him to do Penance in those Sheets; I know not what could have been writ, more fair and inoffensive, than that Book; Schism was the Word, that had animated Men with a strange, Blind Zeal, against all those upon whom their Leading Men had fixed the mark; and it was given out with so much Industry, as if it had been the Shibboleth of the Party, reserved for some special Service against a convenient Season.

## The Preface.

*Mr. H. kindly endeavoured to undeceive them, and by enquiring into the Quality of those Actions, upon which this Sin is charged in Scripture to discover its true formal Nature, that Men might not fight in the dark, and build vast and endless Controversies upon a single Word, and that too not rightly understood.*

He observes that the word Schism is not used in Scripture in any sense applicable to the present Case, save only three times in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, those places he has particularly examined. He shews that those Schismatical Corinthians met in the same place still, but contending with one another, about some lesser matters to the breach of Christian Love, and Mutual Alienation of their Affections, fell into the Sin there called Schism; concluding from hence, that the formal Nature of this Sin consists not in Separation of Communion, but in the Violation of that Love and Charity there ought to be amongst Christians; Acknowledging nevertheless, that many Overt Actions may be, and are Schismatical, as they proceed from this Uncharitableness; and he mentions such as these, Judging and Condemning one another about the Circumstantials of Religion; reproaching and reviling each other; making, approving, and executing Penal Laws, about such things; and Separation from Communion with those we have joyn'd our selves to without cause; that is, (as he explains it) without regard had to any thing amiss in the Church we separate from, or any thing better in that we joyn our selves to, which he calls Separation for Separation's sake; This is Schism, not barely because Separation, but because animated by that Uncharitableness and Disaffection, which in Scripture is known by the Name of Schism.

The Gentlemen, could not digest a Notion so far different from what he had imbib'd; but tells us, Mr. H's Book had not much more of Schism than of the Philosopher's Stone in it: He was loth so heavy a Charge should be against Uncharitableness, which being a main Ingredient in his own Constitution, must be more softly and tenderly handled, he thinks it more Prudent to lay the Fault so, as he may bear the least share of it himself; and therefore boldly affirms, that Diversity of Communion is the Ratio formalis of Schism; and more than that, says he, has proved it to be so.

The Author of the Vindication justly blam'd him, for so rash and confident an Assertion, as giving the Lye to the Word of God, which Charges the Corinthians with the Guilt of Schism, when there was no such diversity of Communion; and can there be a Schism where that is wanting, which he calls the true formal Nature of Schism? Can a thing exist without its Essential Form? To this, the Gentleman replies, "Shall a Cut in the Arm be truly Schism, and not the separating the Arm from the Body? If Paul condemn'd the Corinthians of Schism, for preferring one Minister before another, Shall that far greater Crime of

separa-

## The Preface.

separating from them, be excluded from Schism? This Gentleman is a Topping Accuser.

But we cannot Complement this Gentleman so far as to call him a Topping Defendant; For the Question was not, Whether there may not be a Separation that is really Schismatical, Mr. H. granted that; But whether Separation be the very Essence and formal Nature of Schism? If so, then there can be no Schism without such Separation; which is false, as in the Case of the Corinthians; nor any Separation without Schism, which is equally false; for in many cases we may be obliged in Duty to separate: His Comparison of Cutting the Arm from the Body is like it self, Lame and Defective; for sometimes such a Scissure may be necessary to keep the Body from perishing: In short, if Separation be needless, it is sinful; if Uncharitable, it is Schismatical; if neither needless nor Uncharitable, it is a Duty; And let it be observed by the way, that in this Reply, the Gentleman acknowledges the Corinthians were guilty of Schism, though they did not Separate; when before he told us, he had proved that the Ratio formalis of Schism, consists in Separation, let him reconcile those things at his leisure.

He thinks if such Uncharitableness be Schism, it must follow, a minority ad majus, diversity of Communion is much more so; but the reasoning is not good; for Uncharitableness can in no case be lawful, but Separation may: He himself acknowledges, that if any of their terms of Communion be sinful, our Separation is justifiable; and yet even in that case, Uncharitableness would be a Sin.

If this Gentleman must needs let the World see his Talent in Controversy, he should have taken up the true Question, as it was laid before him, What is that which the Scripture calls Schism? and should have proved in all those Instances, where mention is made of it, that there was not only Alienation of Affection, but diversity of Communion; and when he had done this, it had been time enough to have boasted, that he had answered Mr. H's Enquiry, till then his Labour is impertinent, and his Triumphs ridiculous.

But instead of observing this Proper and Necessary Method, which by all the Laws of Argument he was bound to, he ranges from the Point, and Chimes upon those decantate terms, Church, Unity, Communion, Obedience, Succession, &c. and is wonderfully pleased with the melodious Sound of words he does not understand; for though he should from these Topics, prove the Practice of Dissenters to be sinful, yet he cannot prove it to be that Sin which in Scripture is called Schism, unless he can discover in it, that Uncharitableness, and want of Christian Affection, which is the very thing called by that Name in sacred Writ.

This would be sufficient for the Defence of Mr. H's Enquiry, without ever entering upon the Lawfulness or Faults of Nonconformity; but since

## The Preface.

the Valiant Man has challenged us into that Field of Argument, we have gone along with him into it, and endeavoured to justify our Practices not only from the Crime of Schism, but any other of which it has been accused, and how far we have succeeded in this Affair, is with all possible respect referred to the Censure of the Learned and Moderate of both Perswasions.

The grand Impertinencies exposed in the Gentleman's first Paper, he has endeavoured to defend in the latter; but through the Common Misfortune of a Man that meddles with what he does not understand, he is more bewildred and confounded than before; and indeed of all things that ever set up for a Defence of so Learned a Party as the Episcopal, I never saw any thing comparable to this, for Style and Argument, unless it were the famous Works of Mrs. Eleanor James, to which this Gentleman's Reply bears such a marvellous resemblance, that a man would almost conclude it to be the issue of some Friendly Conference betwixt our Citizen, and that renowned Heroine.

I wonder why he should be so much disturbed, that the Vindicator has concealed his Name, especially when he did not think fit to discover his own; for T. W. Citizen of Chester, is a Cypher so general, as remits us to conjecture, and common fame, and leaves him room to escape, if any such danger should happen, as he portends concerning his adversary; but what great matter is it, who is meant by T. W. or what that mans name is, that has adventured to encounter him; it is not names, but things, that we have to examine; and yet by his little contemptible menaces, it is very apparent, that he would gladly betake himself to their former way of Confusing Dissenters, at that which was always found to be the most easie and effectual.

He Triumphs in the Effects of his former Paper, one of which was, few believed but that it was done by some Clergy-man, who had prevailed with him to Print it in his Name; That is to say, they thought it beyond the length of T. W. to write such a Book; a shrewd sign, that his Neighbours have no great Opinion of his Abilities, if they thought such stuff was above him; but as his Name is capable of giving little Reputation to another mans work, so I dare say no Clergy-man in Chester will grudge him the Honour of his own.

He would not be thought, to have acted beneath himself in his Reply, and therefore he magnifies the Suture of his Adversary, and transforms the Vindicator into a Ship, and by all means, it must be one of the first Rate, that was chosen to Attack and Fire all its Guns, at his mighty Self, so happy a thing it is to have Gazetts and News Letters always at hand, where a man can never fail of being furnished, with Admirable Metaphors, but (if we must needs speak in such Bombardick Language) though the Vindicator was fixe enough, for the



## The Preface.

the Services assigned him, yet there was no need of abusing a Man of War of the first Rate, to engage a disabled Frigate, whose Mast and Tackling, had suffered miserably in some hot Sea-fights heretofore. Venus on a Mari.

But 'tis no part of my design, to wrangle with him in his Bantering Dialect, I shall therefore apply my self in good earnest, to the matter in Hand, and in the Remainder of this Preface, defend some lesser Passages in the Vindication, which this Gentleman either does not understand, or will not seem to do so, and afterwards proceed to the more material parts of the Controversie.

In his first Paper he pretends to tell us, of the Origination and first Existence of the Church, which he dates only from the time of Pentecost, mentioned Acts 2. The Vindicator thought there was Reason to find fault with that Account of the Matter, not only because it excludes the Angels, which but a few Lines before, this Gentleman had told us, were members of the Church, but especially, because it shuts out the Jewish Church, as it stood in Old Testament Times; but he has a Salvo ready such as it is, and he that can content himself with such a one will never be at want, for thus it goes, "The Church was never called Catholick before that Pentecost, the Wall of Partition not being broken down; But if I mistake not, he promised to shew us, when the Church had its first Existence, not when it acquired a new Title; it's an odd way of arguing, The Church was first called Catholick at Pentecost, therefore it had its first Existence then, a miserable Consequence, and yet as good as the Antecedent, for it is not true that the Church was called Catholick at that time, nor do we find it once so called in all the Scripture that I know of (and the Wall of Partition was broken down at Christs Death, when the Vail of the Temple was rent in sunder) and if in spite of all Reason the Existence of a Church must needs commence with its acquist of a new Title, he must still fix his Epocha much lower; and yet I know not, why the Name Catholick, may not (if men please) be attributed to the Jewish Church, which was before its Apostacy the whole, and the true Visible Church of God upon Earth.

The Vindicator told him, nothing could be proved from the bare Name of Bishops in Scripture-times, to favour our English Prelacy, till the Power of those Bishops, the Extent of their Dioceses, the Quality of their Under-Officers, the Modes of their Worship, and Terms of Communion, be proved to be the same with ours, or liable to the same Exceptions; To this the Gentleman replies, "I cannot understand this last Sentence (or liable to the same Exceptions,) unless he would make the Primitive Church liable to the same Exceptions; But I hope we are not to be blamed, for the dullness of his understanding; The Expression is Plain and Pertinent, He knows very well what Exceptions we



## The Preface.

make, against the Power of our English Prelates, &c. Now if he can prove that the same Objections lye against the Primitive Episcopacy, he shows thereby that they are frivolous and unjust, and throws them out of doors, as militating against Scripture Bishops as well as ours; one would have thought the meanest Citizen in Chester, might have understood this, but it will never be better, when men take upon them to be Authors, in spite of Nature and Education.

He condemns the Vindicator, as having no regard to Ecclesiastical Antiquity, for speaking of Scripture Rules, before they were written, this lets us see, What Mercy we may expect from him, when we stand in need of it: We will endeavour therefore to be as little beholden to him as we can; and as to this matter, a few Words will evince, that his Reflection is very unjust.

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 2.

In his former Paper, speaking of the Progress of the Gospel, and planting the seven Asian Churches, in St. Johns time, he adds, Though there was a Multiplication of Churches, yet no Variation; here the Vindicator enquired; What does he mean in saying there was no Variation? Was there no variety at all in any Circumstance of Worship that's *gratia dictum*? if he means there was no Variation from Scripture Rules, (though we are afraid that will scarce hold yet) we wish it had been so still. Now it seems the Vindicators Errour was, he spoke of Scripture Rules in the Apostolical Age, and they were not then written; No? That's something strange, were not the Gospels and Epistles writ by Evangelists and Apostles, during the time of their Lives? No Legend that ever I heard of, tells us of their rising from the dead, and writing to the Churches; And if they writ their Epistles, containing Rules for Divine Worship, why may not these be called Scripture Rules: What if they were not Collected as soon as they were writ, were they not therefore both Scripture, and Authoritative? And yet very Learned Men think the Canon of Scripture was collected in St. Johns time, and that this awful Sanction, If any shall add to these things, God will add unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book, &c. Refers not only to the Apocalypse, but to the whole Canon, and stands like the Cherna with a flaming Sword to Guard the Tree of Life, and if this Gentleman be for Scripture Rules, that were not written in the Time of the Apostles, I despair of ever coming to an agreement with him.

And it is certain, there is a very material difference betwixt us, about the Rule and Standard of Controversie, which must be first adjusted, before we can well proceed any further, for if we take different Measures, we shall certainly give a very different account.

Mr. H. desirous to find out the true Notion of Sebisim, takes for his Rule, all those places in the New Testament, where that Word is found;

Thi

## The Preface.

*This the Gentleman is offended at, and tells him, "If he had enquired into the ninth Article of the Apostles Creed, then he had found out the true Standard of this Controversie; And the Vindicator thought, there was more Reason to be offended with him, for declining the sufficiency of the Scripture, as the standard of Faith and Practice, than be censured as an affront to Scripture, and common Sense too, for when the Authority of that Creed depends solely upon its agreement with Scripture, how senseless a thing is it, to make that a truer Standard than Scripture, whose Truth and meaning is to be derived purely from it? What defence now will the Citizen make? As good as he can afford no doubt; He charges the Vindicator with saying, that an Article of Faith, is an affront to Scripture and Common Sense, which is as false as any thing in the World, we appeal to the Readers Eyes, and desire no other favour, but that be Read true.*

*To bring himself off, he acknowledges, "That the Scripture indeed is the truest touch-stone of Sin and Duty, but he adds, whoever be that expounds the Holy Scripture, in Contradiction to an Article of the Creed, must needs err; and we are assured of the Error, by that Article is contradicted.*

*Should we grant this to be good Sense and Divinity, yet it will not serve his turn; for then he should not have accused Mr. H. of taking a wrong Standard, but have proved, that he made an Erroneous Application of the true One to his Case, which are two different things; a man may take a true measure, and yet mistake in measuring a thing by it, but to tell him in the former Paper, of not finding out the true standard, and to think to come off in this, by blaming his Exposition of it, is a very sorry shift, which his Ignorance, or Inadvertency has forced him upon.*

*And yet we must not let him go, without further Examination about this matter, for it is certain he is fallen into a most dangerous Error, making the Compilers of the Apostolical and Nicene Creeds, the Infalible Interpreters of Scripture; for so he tells us. We come to be infallibly assured, that the Socinian Interpretation of Scripture against the Divinity of Christ is False, because it contradicts that Article, I believe in Jesus the onely begotten Son of God, and that in the Nicene Creed, God of God, very God of very God, being of one Substance with the Father.*

*This is an Opinion, which his own Spiritual Guides, are obliged to chastize him for, being so contrary to the avowed Principles of all Protestant Churches, and to what our Learned Doctors have worthily asserted in their late Writings against the Papists, to which I refer him for his better Information, amongst others, let him consult the Ingenious Dr. Shetlock, in his Preservative against Popery, where having declared that*

Reply, p. 12.

## The Preface.

Part 1st.  
P. 49.

the Protestants abide by that, which they see plainly proved out of Scripture, bids us put this Question, "How shall we know what is the true sense of Scriptures, and proposes three ways, either by an Infallible Interpreter, or the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, or by such humane means as are used, to find out the sense of other Books; He rejects the Pretensions of an Infallible Interpreter, and disapproves of the Rule of Expounding Scripture by the Consent of the Fathers, and concludes there is no way left, but to expound it as we do other Writings, by considering the Signification, and Propriety of Words, and Phrases, the Scope and Context of the Place, the Reason of things, the Analogy between the Old and New Testament, and the like.

Our Citizen has found out that Infallible Interpreter, which the Learned Doctor was ignorant of; He is infallibly assured of the Divinity of Christ, because the Compilers of the Apostolical and Nicene Creeds, have so Interpreted Scripture; but what if one should ask him, How he is sure the Doctrines of the Creed are true Expositions of Scripture? Either he must fall into the Circle, or resolve his Faith into the Infallibility of the Church, and Compilers of those Creeds; and therein he turns his back upon the Church of England, and all the Reformed, in one of the Principal and most Important Points of Controversie, the Resolution of Faith.

I will not suppose him so ignorant, as to think that the Apostles were the Authors of that Creed, that goes under their Name; Bishop Pearson, and Dr. Towerlson, will tell him the contrary, and by the Confession of all Protestants, These Creeds are but summary Collections of the most principal Doctrines of Faith, put into that form by Fallible Men, and are to be received no further, and on no other account, than as they are Consonant to the Word of God, and therefore were never intended, as a Standard or Rule of Faith, or as an infallible Interpreter of that which is so; I wonder how this Gentleman would have been infallibly assured of the Divinity of Christ, if he had lived before these Symbols were extant, I wonder, how he is infallibly assured of the true sense of these Creeds? I doubt, he wants one Creed to give an Infallible Interpretation of another, and so ad Infinitum; but if he say, the sense of these Creeds is very plain and obvious to any ordinary Capacity, so is the Scripture too in all Fundamental Points, and is sufficient Assurance of the Truth of them, without the joint Security of Ancient Creeds and Churches.

Whether these odd Opinions, are to be imputed to his inconsiderateness, of which every Page affords us instances enough; or rather to the Happy

## The Preface.

Illuminations, of his great Rabbi, Mr. Dodwell, I will not determine; but the latter is not improbable, if we compare it, with what that Ambitious Gentleman writes, "That the Power actually received by Ordained Ministers must not be measured by the true Sense of Scriptures, Separation of Churches, p. 542. but by that wherein the Ordainers understood them, &c. Many other Effects of the like Nature, have proceeded from that great Oracle, which would scarcely have been encouraged or so much as suffered in any Reformed Church besides our own, but it was sufficient to make these things passable, that they were levelled at the Dissenters, and sent them all headlong into the Pit.

I think it may not be amiss to defend the Vindicator from the Imputation of Malice, against the late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, which this Gentleman very unfairly suggests; the Passage aimed at, is this, "To say, that Bishops, which are stated Pastors in an Organical Vindic. p. 18. Church, are the Apostles Successors, in their Apostolical Power, is destructive to their own Notion of Church Government, and would give the Bishop of Rome as great Power in England, as the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury (when there is any.) All the Malice lies in this little Parenthesis, when there is any, and here the Citizen clamours upon him, for reviling Gods High Priest, and speaking evil of the Ruler of his People; What Apology will the Vindicator now make? Truly, if it was my own Case, I would desire no better, than that of St. Paul under the same Accusation, I wilt not Brethren, that he was the High Priest. The late Arch-Bishop, had been deprived by Law, above half a Year before that Vindication was writ, and the Metropolitane See was vacant, a considerable time after this was Printed, and yet it was a malicious Reviling of the Ruler of Gods People, to say there was none, I will not drive this too far, I hope he can give a better Reason for calling the Deprived Prelate the Ruler of Gods People than I can for him; If he was the Ruler still, What becomes of the Authority of those that deprived him? It had been more becoming this Gentleman, to have answered that Argument, wherein this Parenthesis had its Place, than by falling foul upon so Innocent an Expression, to expose those thoughts, which Prudence would have concealed. Reply, p. 19.

I know not of any thing else in his Reply that needs to be taken notice of, but what will fall under the General Heads of this following Treatise; wherein I have attempted (at least) to prove, that our Congregations, are not Schismatical, or Unlawful, though many of our Ministers, were not Ordained by Diocesan Bishops, though the Places we meet in be distinct from the Parish Churches, and the Mode of our Worship in some things different from theirs.

And

## The Preface.

*And because I find the most Learned of our Adversaries condemn our Present Practice,*

1. *As Inconsistent with Catholick Unity and Communion.*
2. *As Guilty of Disobedience to Superiours, Civil and Spiritual.*
3. *And of Scandalous Indecencies, and a Breach of good Rules and Order, I shall examine the matter as carefully as I can under all these Particulars, heartily Praying that whatever Censures, I bring upon my self, the Interests of Truth and Peace may be promoted.*

---

## ERRATA.

**P**Age, 6. l. 38. *r.* retain'd. p. 16. l. 13. *r.* conscious-  
ness. p. 20. margin, *r.* August. p. 33. l. 38.  
*r.* Diaboli instigatu. p. 37. l. 15. & p. 38. l. 12.  
for *rite*, *r.* *right*. p. 117. l. 17. for *Ananias* *r.* *A-*  
*nianus*. Several lesser faults will occur, which are  
referr'd to the Reader's Candor and Emendation.



# A Defence of the Vindication, &c.

## CHAP. I.

*The true Notion of Catholick Unity; distinguished into Political and Moral. A Regular Ministry not Essential to this Unity. The Judgment of the Fathers and others.*

**I**T is the observation of an Ingenious Gentleman, that the World has never been without some extraordinary word, to fill mens mouths, and furnish out Pamphlets, and by which the Sentiments of men, have been for the most part more absolutely governed, than by the true reason of things, for Reason concludes nothing, without disquisition; but the other, like a kind of spell, captivates and determines mens thoughts, many times beyond the Relief, of the most rational and convincing Arguments.

Amongst all the Charms of this nature, which take place as the Interests and Designs of Parties, or posture of Publick Affairs, vary and direct, I know of none, that has been more unmercifully tortured, and forced to speak things never intended by it, than this of *Unity*: It has been the Motto, and Device, of every Ascendant Party, in the Militant Church, to frighten the weak and timorous, and chastise the more resolute opposers of Spiritual Usurpation and Tyranny.

The Papists, for the good Service it has done them, have prefer'd it to be the Seventh Note of their Church, according to the Order in which their great Cardinal has marshall'd them; and under the Umbrage thereof, have raised the greatest Feuds and Divisions, that ever infested the Christian World. In their most bloody Persecutions, barbarous and funest Tragedies, they have still pretended to act by the Commission of Catholick Unity, to advance her Interests, and to make her glorious in the World; when in the mean time, Christianity it self has been rendred odious and contemptible, *Ridente Twca, nio dolente* Turks, Jews, and Pagans, have beheld her flames with pleasure, and warmed *Judeo.* themselves, and said, *Aba, shas we would have it.*

It must not be denied, but that Catholick Unity, where it is so happy as to be understood, acquaints us with something very sacred and venerable, of which we cannot be too fond or tender, it bears the Image of Divinity; and if it were not in it self a most excellent thing, the name of it, could never be made so specious a pretence.

## The Preface.

*And because I find the most Learned of our Adversaries condemn our Present Practice,*

1. *As Inconsistent with Catholick Unity and Communion.*
2. *As Guilty of Disobedience to Superiours, Civil and Spiritual.*
3. *And of Scandalous Indecencies, and a Breach of good Rules and Order, I shall examine the matter as carefully as I can under all these Particulars, heartily Praying that whatever Censure, I bring upon my self, the Interests of Truth and Peace may be promoted.*

## ERRATA.

**P**Age, 6. l. 38. *r.* retain'd. p. 16. l. 13. *r.* consciouf-  
ness. p. 20. margin, *r.* August. p. 33. l. 38.  
*r.* Diaboli instinctu. p. 37. l. 15. & p. 38. l. 12.  
for rite, *r.* right. p. 117. l. 17. for Ananias *r.* A-  
nianus. Several lesser faults will occur, which are  
referr'd to the Reader's Candor and Emendation.

# A Defence of the Vindication, &c.

## CHAP. I.

*The true Notion of Catholick Unity; distinguished into Political and Moral. A Regular Ministry not Essential to this Unity. The Judgment of the Fathers and others.*

**I**T is the observation of an Ingenious Gentleman, that the World has never been without some extraordinary word, to fill mens mouths, and furnish out Pamphlets, and by which the Sentiments of men, have been for the most part more absolutely governed, than by the true reason of things, for Reason concludes nothing, without disquisition; but the other, like a kind of spell, captivates and determines mens thoughts, many times beyond the Relief, of the most rational and convincing Arguments.

Amongst all the Charms of this nature, which take place as the Interests and Designs of Parties, or posture of Publick Affairs, vary and direct, I know of none, that has been more unmercifully tortured, and forced to speak things never intended by it, than this of *Unity*: It has been the Motto, and Device, of every Ascendant Party, in the Militant Church, to frighten the weak and timorous, and chastise the more resolute opposers of Spiritual Usurpation and Tyranny.

The Papists, for the good Service it has done them, have prefer'd it to be the Seventh Note of their Church, according to the Order in which their great Cardinal has marshall'd them; and under the Umbrage thereof, have raised the greatest Feuds and Divisions, that ever infested the Christian World. In their most bloody Persecutions, barbarous and funest Tragedies, they have still pretended to act by the Commission of Catholick Unity, to advance her Interests, and to make her glorious in the World; when in the mean time, Christianity it self has been rendred odious and contemptible, Turks, Jews, and Pagans, have beheld her flames with pleasure, and warmed themselves, and said, *Aha, this we would have it.*

*Ridente Turca,  
nec dolente  
Judeo.*

It must not be denied, but that Catholick Unity, where it is so happy as to be understood, acquaints us with something very sacred and venerable, of which we cannot be too fond or tender, it bears the Image of Divinity; and if it were not in it self a most excellent thing, the name of it, could never be made so specious a pretence.

B

It

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 28.  
Reply, p. 1.

It has been often, and confidently asserted, that all the Dissenters in *England*, have departed from the Unity and Communion of the Catholick Church: This lies as a mighty prejudice in the minds of many, both against our way, and persons too; and their common Inference from hence is, That we are out of a State of Salvation, have no right to any of the Promises of the Gospel, that all our Hopes are unwarrantable and groundless Fancies, that we are contemners of the Peace and Unity which Christ has bequeathed to his Church; and if they will demonstrate, that our case is indeed such as they describe it, we will not persist in it a day longer, for we cannot be so fond of the Inconveniencies of Non-Conformity here, as meerly for the sake thereof to purchase to our selves, greater Miseries hereafter.

But that we may evince, how void of Reason and Humanity, the Sentence which they have past upon us is, let us enquire, wherein the Catholick Unity and Communion of the Church consists, and then try, whether none of our Dissenting Congregations be within the Verge of it.

By this Catholick Unity, our Adversaries understand, not that which is accidental, may be present or absent without the destruction of the Subject, which some Churches may have, and other True Churches may be without, for then it would not serve their purpose, which is to conclude all that want this Unity, to be in a State of Damnation; and indeed it is the truest acceptation of the word, to make it signifie Essential Universal Unity, (Uniformity in accidentals belonging more properly to the common place of order) in this sense, therefore we shall speak of it, that we may come up as close to their thoughts as we can.

Nothing then belongs to the Catholick Unity of the Church, but what belongs to the being of the Church; that which makes it a Church makes it one; *Ens & Unum* being convertible; and nothing can dissolve its Unity which does not destroy its Essence; and certainly the being, and the state of the Church must not be confounded: Many things are required to the due and orderly state and form, in which the Church ought to be, and appear in the World, and which may contribute to her stability, beauty and enlargement, which suppose her Essence, but do not constitute it.

This Essential Catholick Unity whereof we speak, may be distinguished into Political and Moral.

Political, whereby all the True Members of the Church are united unto Christ the Head, and that is by true Faith: And

Moral, by which they are United one to another, and that is by Christian Love, which in some degree always follows the former; those that have a mind to it, may quarrel with the terms of this distinction; but if I may but express my meaning by them, I shall not be at all concerned about it.

1. *The Political Unity*, is that which does primarily, necessarily, and immediately constitute, that Sacred Society, the Church of God, which was therefore by the Primitive Christians, as well as our first Reformers, frequently known by this short definition, *Cetus fidelium*, the Congregation of the

the Faithful ; sometimes, the Body of Christ, the Temple of God, and such like : So *Lactantius*, *Ecclesia est verum Templum Dei quod non in parietibus est, sed in corde, & fide hominum, qui credunt in eum, & vocantur fideles* ; The Church is the True Temple of God, which does not consist in the bare Walls, but in the Hearts, and Faith of Men that believe on him, and are called Faithful ; and before him *Ignatius*, in the same sense calls it, *Εκκλησία θελημένη, συναθροισμα ζώντων, συναγωγή ιστών*, The Holy Congregation, the Assembly of the Saints. To the same purpose speak all those Fathers who affirm, that the Church was built upon the Faith of *Peter*, not upon his Person or Authority, a great Cloud whereof, the Illustrious *Chamier*, has collected to our hand, proving thereby, that our Union with the Church, is founded in our believing on Christ, the True Foundation, and Chief Corner Stone ; nothing therefore can dissolve this Union, but what is inconsistent with True Faith in Christ.

And this agrees fully, with the tenour of Holy Scripture, which every where lays the Salvation of Men upon their believing, *1 Pet. 2. 6. Behold I lay in Zion a Chief Corner Stone, elect, precious, and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.* By this Faith Men are United to Christ, and therefore cannot be divided from his Body which is the Church. *St. Paul* calls the Church of God, the House or Family of God, and how a Man comes to be a Member of that Noble Family, we are told, *Eph. 2. 18.* by the Spirit (*i. e.* working of Faith) we have access unto the Father, and are no more Strangers and Forerangers, but Fellow-Citizens of the Saints, and of the Household of God ; and therefore this Household of God is elsewhere called the Household of Faith. In short, nothing is more evident than that the Apostles received Men and Women into the Visible Church by Baptism, upon the Profession of their Faith in Christ, and thereby invested them in all the Sacred Privileges of the New Covenant, which belong only to the Church of God.

This Excellent Grace of Faith, from whence our Union with Christ, and his Body the Church doth flow, is a very comprehensive thing, it includes our solemn and hearty Choice of the Eternal God, as our chiefest Happiness, and hereby all the True Members of the Church, are United in the Love and Service of One God, and so distinguished from the Pagan World ; and in an humble assiance in One Mediator, in whose hand alone, they are brought back unto God, and hereby are distinguished from Mahometans, and those that call themselves Deists, they are also United in the gracious Influences of One blessed Spirit ; and hereby are distinguished from all impenitent sensual persons, who have grieved and quenched that Spirit : And they are hereby United in One Rule of Faith, Worship, and Obedience ; not that they all understand this Rule alike, or are fully conformed unto it ; but in this they agree, that they all take it for their Rule, and endeavour an Universal Compliance with it, and are distinguished hereby from all that reject this Law, and set up any other in opposition to it : This Faith likewise Unites them



in One Baptism, not that they all agree in the External Wash' and Modes of Administration, but in that which the Apostle *Peter* makes to be the Substance of it, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the power of  
 1 Pet. 2. 21. a good Conscience towards God, when a Mans Conscience returns a consenting Answer to the Gospel Proposals, and by a solemn Self-dedication becomes Sacred to God, he has then the Substance of that Ordinance.

This is the True Catholick Unity, described in the 4th of *Ephes.* 5, 6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as you are called in one Hope of your Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and the Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*

2. *The Moral Unity*, by which the Members are knit one to another, is that of Love: This is the Unity of the Spirit, which is to be held in the bond of Peace, and will always flow from the other, by a kind of Spiritual Sympathy and Senfation; but it must be acknowledged, this admits of various degrees, and is subject to sinful Declensions; Emulation, Passion, Interest, Misunderstanding of Persons and Things, may very much weaken the Bond of Amity, but it must be habitually in every True Christian; and he that has no brotherly kindness, for those that appear to him True Believers can never know that he has passed from Death to Life.

Mistakes and Weakness, may create Jealousie, and too great Distances even amongst great and good Men. *Paul* and *Barnabas* from different apprehensions about the management of their Work, proceed to a parting one from another: And too many Brethren, that have all the same Father, and are all bound for the same home, cannot forbear falling out by the way: The Corruption of Nature both sullies mens Graces, that they do not shine forth so clearly as otherwise they would, and also darkens their sight, that they cannot so well discern the Virtues of each other, and where the Eye is dim, and the Object clouded too, no wonder if misapprehensions and uncharitable surmises arise, and men mistake one another for Enemies, and fall a quarrelling, when perhaps a true Light would let them see they are all Friends.

But certainly, as far as Believers understand one another, they have Christian Affection one for another; and if they knew more of the Truth of each others Christianity, their Mutual Love would be greatly encreased. And a shyness in some tempers, and unwillingness to converse more freely, and often together, keep up mens prejudices, and hinder their desired Union; and yet they have still a fervent Love for the Church in general, though their Affections be misplaced as to particular persons.

This Brotherly-kindness, where it is prevalent, will oblige the Members to have the same care one for another, not envying, but rejoicing at each others Health, Beauty, and Improvement, it would make them sensible of each others usefulness and service, they would not think any part superfluous, or tie it up from performing its duty towards the good of the whole; the Eye would not say to the Hand, I have no need of thee: This would not permit

mit them to reproach and despise each other, for their blemishes and deformities, but oblige them to cover the same with the greatest candour and civility, and to bestow more abundant honour upon those parts that may be thought less honourable.

This is that great Law of Love which the King of the Church has given to all his Disciples, as the Bond of Peace amongst themselves, and the great Characteristick by which they shall be distinguished from others: By this shall all men know that they are Christ's Disciples, if they love one another. Where the Soul is wholly destitute of this, all pretences of Love to God, or Faith in Christ, are false and vain; *For he that loves not his Brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen?* And true Faith will work by Love. John 13. 35.

I know this Account of Catholick Unity, as consisting in Faith and Love, will not meet with general approbation: Many will reject it as to spiritual, who have placed their hopes of Salvation in being of such a Party, and in a Zealous Observation of the Rites and Ceremonies of that Communion in which they are, these are too senseless to be argued with, That can suppose the Son of God would be incarnate, and crucified, only to teach men a particular kind of dress, and fashionable gestures, and a form of words, &c. whilst their Souls are under the dominion of sin, and they have not learned to live soberly, righteously, and godly in an Evil World. John 4. 20.

Many will censure it as too narrow, excluding from the Church, all formal and insincere pretenders to Christianity; but I suppose when we understand one another, we shall not much differ about this; it is certain *in Foro Dei*, none but true Disciples are true Church-Members; but *in Foro Ecclesiae*, all that seem to be so, must be so accounted. When we say, such a one is a Member of the Visible Church, we mean, he is visibly a Member of the Church, that is, he appears so to us, and we are obliged to think so of him, till he discovers the contrary; but whether he be really so or no, God only knows.

And most will condemn this Notion, as too large and general, including even those that have not a Regular Ministry amongst them, nor are joyned to any particular Congregation, duly organized: And here indeed the main difficulty we have to encounter is about the Unity of the Ministry, and how far that is essential to the Unity of the Catholick Church.

And I freely grant, every True Member of the Church of Christ, will give great deference to the Ministerial Office; and whoever they be, that will presume to ridicule the Function, and despise its just Powers, cannot in reason be thought to have the Faith and Charity of the Gospel. But there must be a great difference made, betwixt condemning the Ministry, and questioning the Rights of this or that particular person to the Office, or scrupling the Terms or Mode of his Administrations, or preferring another before him, whose Qualifications and Conduct are more answerable to the great Ends of that Office.

But though I do verily believe, it is essential to Catholick Church Unity, that every Member love and honour the Ministerial Function; yet, I dare by no means affirm it to be equally necessary, that every Person be under the Conduct of a Regular and duely called Ministry; this indeed, is requisite to the flourishing State of the Church, and all are obliged to pray for it, and endeavour it in their several Spheres of Activity; but it is not absolutely Necessary to the Being of the Church, or the Salvation of her Members. My Reasons are these:

*Histor. Des. of  
the Reform.  
Part 4. p. 57.*

1<sup>st</sup>. This would be to confound the Unity of the Church, with its Order, which must be distinguished here, where we speak of Essential Unity; that which belongs to the Order of the Church always supposes its Essence; a thing must first be, before it be capable of Order: Thus the Excellent Monsieur *Claude* argues, "To admit that to be a true Church where the Ministry is, and deny that to be a true Church, where the Ministry is not, is a vain, deceitful and illusory way of reasoning; For the true Church naturally goes before the Ministry, and does not depend upon the Ministry, but the Ministry on the contrary depends upon it; as in the Civil Society, the Magistracy depends upon the Society, and not the Society on the Magistracy. In the Civil Society, the first thing that must be thought on, is, That Nature made Men; afterwards we conceive that she Assembled and United them together. And lastly, from that Union which could not subsist without Order, Magistracy proceeded. It is the same thing in a Religious Society: The first thing that Grace did, was to produce Faith in the hearts of Men, after having made them believe she united them, and formed a mutual Communion between them; and, because their Communion ought not to be without Order, and good Government; from thence the Ministry arose. So that a Lawful Ministry is after the true Church, and depending upon it. And a great deal more to the same purpose.

2<sup>dly</sup>, This would make it utterly unlawful for the Laity to Reform the Church from idolatry, or other Abuses, unless the Clergy would joyn with them in it; and so would condemn those Princes and Churches in *Germany*, and elsewhere, that Reformed without their Bishops; yea, against their Wills, and repeated clamorous Prohibitions. Either the Popish Bishops and Clergy, were the regular Ministry of those Churches before the Reformation, or no; if they were not, then there was no Regular Ministry amongst them, and the Line of Succession failed; and either they had no Churches, or else their Churches remain'd their Beings without the Ministry: But if the Popish Clergy were the Regular Ministry, Then either those that Reformed without them, were cut off from the Unity of the Catholick Church, and Reformed themselves into Hell, as the Papiests speak, or else they were still in the Unity of the Church, though at present without a Regular Ministry.

Those that will needs thrust the Unity of the Episcopacy into the Definition of the Catholick Church, would do well to consider, Every Nation was

not

not so happy as *England*, in having Bishops so willing to comply with their Rulers, in a Secession from *Rome*; or in having Rulers so Potent and resolved as ours were: And yet God forbid any Protestant should say, they ought to have delayed their Reformation, till they had disgusted Princes, and complying Bishops to lead them on. Surely, the lawfulness of our Departure from *Rome*, does not depend upon such contingencies. How few Bishops there were that gave the least countenance to *Luther's* Proceedings, none can be ignorant, that has read any thing of the History of that Reformation; the Ministry they had was generally chosen by themselves, out of the most learned of the Laicks, some few of the Priests and Monks falling in; the Nobles themselves sometimes devoted their Gifts to the Service of the Church, as the Prince of *Anhalt*, *Du Plessis*, *Sadeel*, and others; they never insisted upon an uninterrupted Line, but maintained, "That where the true Faith and Doctrine were, there was the true Church: and that it is the Call of *Claudes Hist.* the Church, and the Approbation of the most competent Judges therein, *Dis. Part 4.* that makes a Lawful Call of Persons to that Office, and that the Church *p. 58.* has a full and entire Right to set up Ministers for its Government, supposing it have the true Faith.

3dly, If there can be no true Church without a Regular Ministry, what becomes of the Being of a Church, when its Ministers are dead and banished, and no other yet chosen? By this Notion the Church must be dissolved and die with them, and the Death of the Shepherd must be the Damnation of the Flock; for if the Regular Ministry of each particular Church, be the great Ligament, by which that part is fastned to the whole, it must needs follow, that upon the Failure of the Ministry, it falls off from the Body, and consequently from Christ the Head. If it be replied, that such Societies remain in the Unity of the Church, whilst they desire a true Ministry, and endeavour to get one, though at present they are without it, That's as much as we demand; for then it is not essential to Catholick Unity, that there be a Regular Ministry, but that there be a desire of it; and no doubt all true Christians have such desires, and the great difference amongst them is, which Ministry is most Regular; and, it is their apprehension of the greater Regularity of theirs than of others, that makes each side of them prefer their own before others.

In short, if we admit the absolute Necessity, of such a Ministry, under whose Conduct every Church must be; what shall we say of those Scandalous Tumults and Contentts that have happened about the Election of Bishops? *Vott. de Disp. Cas. Pap. l. 2.* one Party choosing this, another that; sometimes falling to downright blows, *§ 2. Ch. 3.* and the stronger Side winning the day, such things often happened in the earlier Ages of the Church, and sometimes the Controversie was a long time undecided, and yet far be it from us to think the Essence of those Churches was lost, during those Contentions; it is true, some have invented a Metropolitan or Patriarch, to whom those Churches remained United, in the vacancy of the Episcopal Sees, to save the Body from perishing, and over these

the Pope as the principal visible Head of Unity; but I hope I need not prove that there may be Catholick Unity without these.

I expect to be assaulted with that Text, *Rom. 10. 14, & 15. How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a Preacher, and how shall they Preach unless they be sent* by this sending, I know many understand Regular Ordination to the Work of the Ministry; and they would infer from hence, that none can believe, but by the Preaching, of a rightly Ordained Ministry; which must therefore be necessary to the very being of the Church.

*Ruffinus, l. 1.  
c. 10.*

But it is certain, the Word and Works of God never contradict one another, and therefore this cannot be the sense of the place; for we read of great Conversions made, by the Preaching of those, that were never so Ordained; as those of the *Abyssines* by *Frumentius* and *Edesius*, and the *Roman Merchants*, and the *Iberians* by a Captive Maid; as for this Text, it plainly speaks of that Extraordinary Mission of the Apostles to the Gentile World, by them, as Men infallibly inspired for that End, were the great Doctrines of the Gospel delivered, and the perpetual Rule of Faith laid down, this they must by no means have presumed to do, had they not been sent of God; and yet without such a Gospel the World had never believed on Christ, and this Apostolical Doctrine is still the great Instrument, by which God converts Souls sometimes by reading of it themselves, sometimes by hearing it from others, whether duly ordained, or no, sometimes by bringing it to their Remembrance when they are neither reading nor hearing it; though the usual way is by the Preaching of a faithful Ordained Ministry; but to say, that it is never done by other means, cannot be proved by Scripture, and is evidently contradicted by Experience.

*Hist. Des.  
Part 4. p. 54.*

I cannot but have a great value for the Judgment of Monsieur *Claude* in this particular, and shall therefore transcribe his words, in that learned Treatise before mentioned, viz. "It is the Church that produces the Ordinary Ministry, and not the Ordinary Ministry that produces the Church; The Church was the fruit of the Extraordinary Ministry of the Apostles and Evangelists; That Ministry of theirs, produc'd it at first, and not only produc'd it, but it has always made use of that means, or that source for its Subsistence; and we may truly say, That it yet produces it, and that it will produce it unto the End of the World: For it is the Faith that makes, and always will make the Church, and it is the Ministry of the Apostles that makes and always will make the Faith: It is their Voice that calls Christians together at this day; it is their word that assembles them, and their teaching that unites them. It is certain that the Ministry of the Apostles was singular; that is to say, only tyed to their Persons, without Succession, without Communication or Propagation; but it ought not to be thought that it was also transitory, as that of other Men, for it is perpetual in the Church; Death has not shut their Mouths as it has others, they speak, they instruct, they incessantly spread abroad Faith and Holiness"



"ness among the Souls of Christians, and there is not another Fountain from  
 "whence those Virtues can descend but from them. If any demand of us,  
 "what is the perpetual Voice that we ascribe unto them? We answer, That  
 "it is the Doctrine of the New Testament, where they have set down all the  
 "Efficacy of their Ministry, and the whole virtue of that Word, which gave  
 "a Being to the Church; there is their true Chair and Apostolick See; there  
 "is the Center of Christian Unity; there it is that they incessantly call Men,  
 "and joyn them into a Society—— But as to the ordinary Ministry, we  
 "cannot say the same thing of them, it is not their Voice as distinct from  
 "that of the Apostles, that begets the Faith, that assembles Christians into a  
 "Society, or that produces the Church: They are no more but meer Dispen-  
 "sers of the words of the Apostles, or external Instruments, to make us the  
 "better understand their Voice, to speak properly, it is not the Voice of  
 "the ordinary Pastors, that produces Faith, where it was not before, it is the  
 "word of the Apostles themselves; They are no more but those External  
 "Guides, that God has established in the Church to lead Men to the Scrip-  
 "ture, and even such Guides as cannot hinder us from going thither of our  
 "selves, if we will;—— Therefore there is a great difference betwixt  
 "these two sorts of Ministers, the one preceded the Church, the other follows  
 "it; the one has an independent and sovereign Authority, with Infallibility  
 "on its side; the other is exposed to Vices, Disorders, Errors and humane  
 "Weaknesses, inferior to, and depending on the Church.

And indeed to affirm that no Man can be truly converted but by a Regu-  
 lar Ministry, would involve the Minds of Men in endless Perplexities: A  
 Man must know all those things that belong to the due mission of the Prea-  
 cher, and must be assured that all those met in the person, by whose Mini-  
 stry he was helped to believe, before he can know that he has true Faith;  
 this would keep persons in a dark and uncomfortable state all their days,  
 especially if a Line of uninterrupted Succession be necessary to a true Mission;  
 for then a Man must be able to prove, that the Bishop that ordained his  
 Converter, was ordained by another Bishop, and that by another, and so  
 up to the Apostles; which, because no man in the World can be morally  
 assured of, it is impossible for any Man to know that he has true Faith. This  
 is an insuperable difficulty on the one hand.

And on the other, those Persons that know they have true Faith by the  
 powerful effects of it upon their Hearts and Lives, must conclude from hence  
 that their Preachers were duly ordained and called, otherwise they could  
 not have been instrumental in their Conversion; and yet this would not be  
 true, for doubtless there are many honest Souls that fear God, and work  
 Righteousness amongst those Sects, that have no Regular Ministry amongst  
 them: So that this Assertion would rob many Souls of the comfort of a  
 true Faith, because of the uncertainty of their Ministers Mission; and it would  
 confirm others in an irregular and unauthorized Ministry, because of the cer-  
 tainty of their Faith.

I hope by this time I may venture to conclude, That the essential Unity of the Church, consists in Gospel-Faith and Love, hereby Men are made Saints, and united to Christ, and Members of the Catholick Church. Did I think the *Chifler* Gentleman would not yet take it, I would be so civil to him, as to add some more Testimonies.

That of *Clement Alexandrinus* is apposite enough, *The ancient Catholick Church is but one only Church, and assembles in the Unity of one only Faith, by the Will of one only God, and Ministrasion of one only Lord, all those who were before Predestinated to be just, having known them before the Foundation of the World.* So likewise *Origen*, *The Church is the Society of the Saints*; and elsewhere, *The Church which God builds consists in those who are upright, and full of those Thoughts, Words and Actions which lead to Blessedness.* *St. Ambrose* tells us, *The Assembly of the Righteous is God's Tabernacle*, and that *the Saints are the Members of Jesus Christ.* *Terrullian* says, *Where there are Three, there is a Church, though they be Laicks, for every one lives by his own Faith.*

*S. Jerome* speaks to the same purpose, saying, *The Church which is the Assembly of all Saints, is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, because she has in Jesus Christ an Eternal firmness*; (and elsewhere) *The Church is the Assembly of all the Saints.* And again, *The City of the Lord is the Church of the Saints; the Congregation of the Just.* *S. Austin* speaking of the visible or mixt Church, distinguishes it into two Nations, *Jerusalem and Babylon*; the Faithful, and the Wicked: the latter may be in the Visible Church, but are not really of the Church; and says, *The Rights of the Church belong only to the Faithful.*

Amongst the Divines of the Reformed Churches, the Incomparable *Jurieu Passora* speaks as fully to the purpose as we can desire; He describes the Unity of the Church, by the Unity of the Spirit, the Unity of Doctrine, and the Unity of the Sacraments; and exposes the Bishop of *Meaux*, for making the Unity of the Ministry, necessary to Salvation; saying, "They must have lost their Senses that suffer themselves to be deluded with such Imaginations, as if the Medicine must be given by such a hand, or else it would not heal, but poison them; and adds, *Ab my Brethren, open your Eyes upon this Folly, and be ashamed thereof, be sure, every hand that gives you the true Doctrine is good in that respect, the saving remedy of Truth heals, from whomsoever it comes.*

And the same Person, reckoning up the Innovations of the Third Age, mentions amongst the rest *Cyprian's* corrupt Idea of the Church, thereby opening a Door to the most cruel Doctrine that ever was advanced; of which he thus speaks: "He made a false Idea of the Unity of the Church, which he encloses in one external Communion, and because the Unity of one visible Head was not yet invented, he imagined I know not what Unity of Episcopacy, which all the Bishops did individually possess; whereof nevertheless each administered but a part. This inconsistent Imagination, gave place

“ place afterwards for the substitution of one single Head, to the end, that  
 “ a visible Head might be given to the Unity of the visible Communion,  
 “ which might be the Center thereof. --- The Bishop of *Meaux* brags much  
 “ of four or five Passages in St. *Cyprian*, that ancient Doctor goes so far as to  
 “ say, [*There can be no Martyr but in the Church, that when a Man is sepa-*  
 “ *rated from its Unity, 'tis in vain that he sheds his Blood for the Confession of*  
 “ *Jesus Christ.*] This Maxim in a large signification may be suffered, for  
 “ indeed there may be Hereticks, who confessing the Name of Jesus Christ,  
 “ but on the other side ruining the Foundations of the Christian Religion,  
 “ may die for the Religion of Jesus Christ to no advantage. But the Appli-  
 “ cation which St. *Cyprian* makes thereof, is one of those Faults, over which  
 “ wise Men ought to draw a Curtain; he proceeds so far as to apply it to  
 “ the *Novatians*. Now it must be known, that the *Novatians* were good  
 “ Christians, a thousand times better than the Papists, since they did not  
 “ ruine any of the Foundations, but retained and believed all the Christian  
 “ Verities, only they were something severe in Discipline, and would not  
 “ receive those that fell in times of Persecution to the Peace of the Church;  
 “ was not this a fine occasion to say as *Cyprian* did, That a *Novatian* was no  
 “ Christian? — O what temper are the Doctors of the Roman Church,  
 “ that make use of those Excesses which ought to be hid out of honour to  
 “ those Great Men that fell into them? It was *Cyprian's* Zeal, for the Peace  
 “ of the Church and the Hatred he had for Schism, that ran him into that  
 “ Excess, as to think or say, That out of I do not know what Exterior Unity  
 “ of the Church a Man could not be saved; and it was in this Age that Men  
 “ begun to corrupt the Idea of the Church.

P. 149.

I have transcribed thus much, out of the Letters of this Illustrious Divine,  
 because some, noted Men amongst us, lay much stress upon the Authority of  
*Cyprian*, in this Notion of One Communion, and One Episcopacy; though  
 they can make bold to censure him themselves, in the case of Rebaptizing;  
 and the Peoples Duty of withdrawing from the Communion of a Debauched  
 Bishop, in which he is very Positive; and I know not why they should deny  
 us that Liberty they take themselves.

Ep. 68. Ed.  
Goulart,  
p. 201.

But it may be, the Opinion of an Eminent Divine of the Church, would  
 go further with some People than either Scripture, or Fathers, or foreign  
 Authors: And is it not the common sense of that Church that has so often  
 told the World, there is none upon Earth so Learned and Wise as her self;  
 that without the Unity of Episcopacy, there can be no true Church, no Sa-  
 craments, no Salvation? I confess, her Chieftains have been free enogh of  
 such kind of Language, when it has been her Glory to tread upon the  
 Necks of poor Dissenters; but when the Tables were turned, and she had  
 to do with an Adversary that could make as great a Noise about Ca-  
 tholick Unity and Communion as her self, she learned more Modesty and  
 Discretion.

Though they all acquitted themselves well, in their late *Recounters* with the Papists; yet I know none that have come off more cleverly, than the Examiners of *Bellarmin's* Notes of the Church; Upon the seventh Note, P. 164, 165. [*the Unity of the Members amongst themselves*] We have this Account of Church-Unity.

" There is the Unity of submitting to One Head, the Lord Jesus; There  
 " is the Unity of Professing the Common Faith that was once delivered to  
 " the Saints; There is a Unity of Sacraments; a Unity of Obedience to all  
 " the Laws and Institutions of Christ, the Union of Christian Affection and  
 " Brotherly Kindness: The Unity of Discipline and Government, by retain-  
 " ing for substance the same Form that was left in the Church by the Apo-  
 " stles, an Unity of Communion in the Worship and Service of God.—  
 " Now to speak clearly, there ought to be all these Kinds and Instances of  
 " Unity in the Church, but we see evidently they are not all there; I mean  
 " in every part and Member of the Church, and therefore they are not all  
 " necessary to the being of a Church, but some of them are; and they are,  
 " The Acknowledgment of One Lord, the Profession of One Faith, and Ad-  
 " mission into the state of Christian Duties and Privileges by One Baptism;  
 " And this is all that I can find absolutely necessary to the Being of a  
 " Church.

And if they be the same Persons that Vindicate the Discourse of the Notes,  
*Vindic.* p. 20, they speak yet plainer thus: " In such a divided state of Christendom as this  
 — 22 —

" is, meer External Unity and Communion cannot be the mark of a true  
 " Church— All true Christian Churches are United in the most Essential  
*Ephes.* 4. 5, 6. " things; They have *one Hope, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God*  
 " *and the Father of all;* and this makes them one Body, animated by the  
 " same Holy Spirit, which dwells in the whole Christian Church; but still  
 " they are not One entire Communion, but divide and separate from each  
 " other; this we will grant is a very great Fault, but yet if they Commu-  
 " nicate in such things as make one Church, their Quarrels and Divisions  
 " may hurt themselves, but cannot destroy the Unity of the Church, for the  
 " Church is one Body not meerly by the Agreement of Christians among  
 " themselves, but by the Institution of Christ, who has made all those that  
 " profess the same Faith, and are united in the same Sacraments, to belong  
 " to the same Body, to be his own Body: And therefore Christians are never  
 " Exhorted to be One Body, for that they are, if they be Christians, as the  
 " Apostle expressly asserts; but they are exhorted to live in Unity and Con-  
 " cord, because they are One Body, *Eph.* 4. 1, 2, 3.

And in the 25<sup>th</sup> Page, " Those who profess the true Faith of Christ  
 " without any corrupt Mixtures, are Sound and Orthodox Churches; other  
 " Churches are more or less pure, according to the various Corruptions of  
 " their Faith; And thus it is with respect to the Christian Sacraments and  
 " Worship too.

I hope this will be acknowledged very pertinent to our purpose, but if we  
 desire

desire it, he will yet speak more plainly, for when his Adversary had said [*Succession of Doctrine, without Succession of Office, is a poor Plea.*] He answers, "I must needs tell him, it is a much better Plea than Succession of Doctrine; for I am sure, there is not a safe Communion where there is not a Succession of Apostolical Doctrine; but whether the want of a Succession of Bishops will in all Cases unchurch, admits of a greater Dispute: I am sure true Faith in Christ, with a true Gospel Conversation, will save Men; and some Learned Romanists defend the old Definition of the Church, that it is *Ceterum Fidelium*, the Company of the Faithful; and will not admit Bishops or Pastors into the definition of a Church." P. 53.

I have e'en tired my self with these Quotations, not for the sake of our Cause, but out of Civility to the Citizen of *Chester*, and Men of his Temper, that by taking up a false Idea of Catholick Unity, to the Exclusion of all those that have not Diocesan Episcopacy, are animated by it, to the greatest Severities against them, concluding that those who shut themselves out of the Catholick Church, are well enough served if they be cast out of Civil Society, and denied the common Rights and Privileges of Mankind.

Let us now examine this Gentleman's Notions about the Unity of the Church, which may give us a little diversion in our Journey; He charges the Vindicator, with mis-reporting his Description of Unity, omitting that which was necessary to be added; and if he did so, he was very much to blame: But let us turn to the places, and try whether it be so or no. Arch. Rebil, Vol. 8. Ep. 13.

Those words out of which we must draw his Notion of Unity are these, "Though there be a Multiplication of Churches by the encrease of Believers, yet no variation; they are all one with that Church first mentioned in *Jerusalem*, and all One with one another, being all United into one Spiritual Society or Body, under One head Jesus Christ, and are in all things the same with that first Church; United in One Baptism and in One Faith, all partake at the same Table—and so all United in the visible external Worship and Service of God. This Account of the Unity of the Church, the *Vindic.* thus Contracts, "All Churches are One, as United into One Body, whereof Christ is the Head, having the same Baptism, the same Faith, and the same Eucharist. Now what has he omitted, that belonged to this description of Unity? why he should have added, They are all One with that Church first mentioned at *Jerusalem*, but that he left out; and he should have added, They are all one with one another: and again, They are in all things the same with that first Church, but he omitted both these: A very dangerous Omission! But pray, what do all these three Sentences amount to, more than this single Assertion, the Catholick Church is One? Not one of them answers the Question wherein it is One, it is no explanation of the Unity of the Church, to say it is all One with the Primitive Church, and all One with it self, and the same with that first Church; still the Question is, wherein is the Church One? wherein does the Unity of all true Churches consist? For to say they are One, because they are One, and because they are Vindic. p. 16.



are the same, and all One with one another, is a most vain and ridiculous Tautology, which the Vindicator was so civil as to pass by, only fixing upon those words that tell us wherein they are One, even as united into One Body, under One Head, having the same Baptism, Faith and Eucharist, and so united in the Worship of God; the other Phrases barely assert the Unity, these describe and explain it; But this Gentleman knows not when he is well dealt with, but will force us to expose him whether we will or no.

The Vindicator having thus Collected out of his words, a description of Unity, as consisting in the same Lord, and in the same Baptism, Faith and Eucharist, agrees to it with this Explanation, [*that is the same for Substance*] for it does not appear that they all agreed in the Primitive Times in the same Circumstances; and infers from hence that there may be Catholick Unity, without Diocesan Episcopacy and Ceremonies; neither of which he put into his Description.

The Gentleman's reply to this is very remarkable, for thus it goes; "It is plain, all that he drives at here is, that there may be a true Church-Unity without Episcopacy, which Doctrine is a meer Innovation, &c. But why did he not then insert the Unity of Episcopacy in his Description? If he left it out, it was not to be expected the Vindication should foist it in for him, as he now would do himself, but it is too late, and to add it now, is not a Defence of his former Paper, but an Amendment rather, such as it is, but indeed rejected by the most Judicious of the Episcopal Writers, as has been already evinced; to which I will here add one citation more, that I may either recover him out of his frenzy, or leave him inexcusable; 'tis the Learned Author of *The Summary of the late Controversies betwixt the Church of England and the Church of Rome*.

P. 123.

He very well distinguishes between External Ecclesiastical Communion and the Unity of the Church; and says, "The Unity of the Catholick Church consists in One Faith, and Worship and Charity; that indeed such external Communion when occasion offers, shows that we are all Disciples of the same common Lord and Saviour, and own each other for Brethren. But the Church may be the One Body of Christ without being One Ecclesiastical Body, under One Governing Head, which 'tis impossible the whole Christian Church should be; and therefore a Church that divides it self from that Ecclesiastical Body, to which it did once belong, if it have just and necessary Reasons for what it does, is wholly blameless, nay commendable for it, if it have not, it sins according to the Nature and Aggravation of the Crime; but still may be a Member of the Catholick Church, and still enjoy all the Privileges of the Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, and Promises of Everlasting Life; which shews how the Holy Catholick Church in the Creed may be One; Notwithstanding all those Divisions of Christendom, which are caused by the Quarrels of Bishops, and Disputes about Ecclesiastical Canons and Jurisdiction.

Thus

Thus have these Learned and Sober Gentlemen, made up those defects, which the Lord *Verulam* complained of in his day, he sets down amongst the Deficients, and recommends us a wholesome and profitable work, a Treatise touching his degrees of Unity in the City of God: and he tells us, "It exceedingly imports the Peace of the Church, to define what, and of what Latitude those points are, which disincorporate Men from the Body of the Church, and cast them out, and quite Casheir them from the Communion and Fellowship of the Faithful. The bounds of Christian Community are set down, one Faith, one Baptism, and not one Rite, one Opinion, the Coat of our Saviour was entire without Seam, but the Garment of the Church was of divers Colours: In the mean time, it is very likely he that makes mention of Peace, shall receive that answer *Jehu* gave to the Messengers, Is it Peace *Jehu*? What hast thou to do with Peace? Turn and follow me: Peace is not the matter, that many seek after, but parties and siding.

To conclude this point, since the Unity of the Church consists in the true Catholick Faith and Christian Affection, whereby Men are knit to Christ the Head, and to one another; None are out of the Unity of the Church, but those that are destitute of these fundamental Graces, and to affirm this of Protestant Dissenters in general, is a piece of Diabolism which the Gospel abhors, and Humanity it self will be ashamed of. We must first prove that Men are without Faith, before we can prove that they are without the Church, and not (with the Papists) condemn them as void of Faith, because out of the external Communion of their Church. It is a very foolish and mislading method, to prove our interest in the Faith, by our interest in the Church, as if we must first know the true Church, and that we are in it, before we can know the true Faith or that it is in us: this way of arguing has been always condemned by Protestant Writers. The Scripture Test for the trial of our Faith, is a serious endeavour to perfect Holiness in the fear of God; to be careful to maintain good works, &c. And indeed nothing but gross Heresie and known constant Immoralities, can warrant us, in saying, that any who profess to be Christians are destitute of the Faith: and whether Dissenters in *England*, do not generally shew as much of the fear of God, both in their Families and common Conversation as their Neighbours, must be left to the Consciences of all observing Men here, and the righteous judgment of God hereafter.

And I hope they may modestly justifie their pretensions to Christian Love and Charity too; I am sure their quiet and peaceable behaviour under so many years severe Persecution, will plead more strongly for them, than for those by whom they suffered such things; all the World will take notice, how unable those Gentlemen were to bear a very small share of those Severities themselves, which they had for a long time so liberally inflicted upon others.

I am far from the thoughts of charging these things upon the Episcopal Party

*Advances of Learning*, l. 9. p. 472, 473:

*Dr. Stillingfleet, Irenic.* p. 121. God will one day convince men that the Union of the Church lies more in the Unity of Faith and Affection, than in the Uniformity of doubtful Rites and Ceremonies.

Party in general, or even the Clergy themselves ; but all the Nation will bear witness, 'tis too true concerning those Bishops and others that were formerly most uneasy and troublesome to their Dissenting Brethren.

How odd a thing was it, for this Gentleman to begin his Book, with Panegyricks upon Peace, when the avowed design is to justify all those Violations thereof, that have been the scandal of the Protestant Religion. He tells us of a blessed Legacy left us by our dying Redeemer, and why then should we not be suffered to enjoy it ? I am sure we should have been glad to have lived in the obscurest places and circumstances, where we might have enjoyed that Sacred Bequest ; but there were a Generation of Men amongst us, who having spent their own Legacies, would needs deprive us of ours, unless we would surrender the dearer Peace of our own minds. I am afraid it is the conscientiousness of their former guilt, that makes many of them, so very suspicious and jealous of Dissenters as they are ; they can hardly believe that we have any Charity for them, because they know how little they have discovered towards us : And thus the remembrance of what is past, pushes them on to farther abuses, instead of producing fruits meet for Repentance ; whereas I do verily believe the generality of Dissenters can heartily forgive all that's past, and would be glad to see any ground of hope that the same men would not greedily embrace the first opportunity of acting over again their former excesses .

## CHAP. II.

*Of Obedience to our Governours, Spiritual and Civil. That the Jurisdiction of our English Bishops is not Jure Divino ; but Presbyters have as much Power by the Law of God as they. An Answer to the Gentleman's Allegations out of Antiquity. The Judgment of the Fathers, and Councils, and School-men, and our first Reformers, and the Divines of the Transmarine Churches.*

**I** Hope we have safely passed the Ordeal of Catholick Unity ; we now proceed to defend our selves, from the dreadful Accusation of Disobedience to Superiors ; for though our Non-Conformity should not utterly exclude us from the Unity and Communion of the Catholick Church, yet if it involve us in the guilt of Sedition, contempt of our Lawful Governours, and disobedience to their just Commands, our Cause would be bad enough, and we could by no means justify it before God or the World.

The Indictment charges upon us a twofold Disobedience ; First, Disobedience to our Spiritual Governours the Bishops ; And secondly, To the Civil Magistrate likewise ; but we do verily believe our selves to be innocent, and desire

desire an impartial hearing of our just Defence, which will proceed in this Method.

1. We plead that Bishops have no Power by the Law of God, but what Presbyters have as well as they.

2. That the whole Jurisdiction of our English Bishops, and Power of their Canons, is derived from the Civil Magistrate, and Laws of the Land.

3. That the Civil Powers have left us to our Liberty in the case of Conformity, and therefore we are guilty of no Disobedience to them.

The first Position, concerning the Identity of Power in Bishops and Presbyters, has been often and warmly debated, and we can scarce touch it so gently, but it will be resented as an high affront; it is accounted a Plea to their Jurisdiction, which in all Courts has an ungrateful sound, and must expect to be over-ruled, if powerful Interest, and loud Menaces can do it; and yet it seems so clear in it self, both from Scripture, Fathers, and Protestant Divines, our own Reformers not excepted, that were it not for the sake of the Silver Shrines, we cannot suppose it would have been a Controversie at this day in any of the Reformed Churches.

For Scripture Proof, the Point being Negative, the Evidence that is but Negative, must be allowed sufficient. The Word of God no where asserts, that Bishops are a Superior Order to Presbyters, therefore they are not so by that Law: Those that say they are, must produce that Rule which makes them so: If no such Rule appears, the matter is fully concluded against them.

This being a Question concerning a very great Power, extending to a great number of Persons, and producing great Effects, a matter of great distinction and dependencies, ought to have clear and positive Warrant and Commission, from the Word of God. Meer Names and Titles, Suppositions, and fine Probabilities, will not all make a Foundation strong enough, to bear the weight of a Structure, so high and towering, as our English Prelacy.

It is far short of Demonstration to say, the Bishops are the Apostles Successors, and therefore a higher Order than Presbyters: For if they mean that they have the same Power that the Apostles had, and in the same degree, it will distort their own Scheme of Government, and will not only give them power over Presbyters, but over Bishops too, for such power the Apostles had, and it will give every Bishop an Universal Power over all the Churches in the World; If it be said they are only the Apostles Successors in some part of their power, the answer is obvious, so are Presbyters too: and we must enquire in what parts and degrees of power do they succeed them? And why do not Presbyters succeed them in the same powers? And where shall we find any chapter or verse in our Bibles, that thus divide the power, and give some men the power of Doctrine, and others that of Discipline and Orders; where is the discrimination? We find it very plain in Dr. Cosin's Table, not so in those of the Apostles.

Nor is it any more to our satisfaction, to say that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, for the Question is not whether there were Bishops in Scripture times, but whether those Bishops had any power that the Presbyters had not, and if they had, whether it belongs to them as Bishops, or on some other account, *St. Peter* was a Presbyter, and had Authority over Bishops, must we therefore argue that Presbyters had power over Bishops : *Timothy* had Authority to command Bishops too, and joined with *Paul* in Writing a Canonical Epistle to the Bishops and Deacons of *Philippi* ? will it therefore follow that one Bishop has Authority over another ?

And what did *Timothy* and *Titus*, that Presbyters might not do, if they had the same qualifications ? They ordained Elders, and how does it appear that they did not do it, as being Elders themselves ? and that they had not the assistance of others ? And may not Presbyters do so too ? Perhaps it will be said, no, for they have not the Episcopal Power ; but that is the very thing in question, and must be proved, and not taken for granted ; if God has laid no injunction upon them to the contrary men cannot do it ; 'Tis an odd way of reasoning, *Titus* was left to ordain Elders in *Crete*, therefore he was a Bishop, for none but Bishops can Ordain, how do you prove that ? Why because *Titus* was a Bishop and he alone did Ordain ; if this be not a Circular, Precarious and Trifling way of arguing, nothing in the World deserves that name.

But indeed the many removes which *Timothy* and *Titus* made, is argument enough that they were not the fixed Pastors of particular Churches ; no question wherever they came, they were employed in the same work, which they did at *Ephesus* : and why *Titus* by being sent into *Dalmatia*, did not become the Bishop of the Churches there, as well as by being left in *Crete*, the Bishop of the *Cretians*, I see no reason ; he was sent to the one, he was left in the other ; and doubtless in both, his work was to set in order the things that were wanting, and this was his business every where, and would as well entitle him the Bishop of any other place, as of *Crete*.

The argument from the Angels of the Churches, is as dark and inconclusive as the former: those messages sent to the Churches were delivered by Vision, and in the style and phrase of Vision, a singular term is often to be understood collectively : as by the false Prophet, *A. B. Usher* understands the Roman Clergy ; and there are many words in those Epistles that favour this Interpretation, *ὁμῶς δὲ λέγω καὶ λαοίς*, &c. and there is not one word in all that Book, intimating that those Angels were single persons, much less such as had any power above Presbyters. And those that grant them to be single persons will tell us; the most that can be infer'd, is a President or Moderator of a Presbytery, which is allowed by those that are wholly dissatisfied with Diocesan Prelacy.

The Gentleman passes very lightly over all these difficulties, and in a strain of carelessness and confidence natural to him, tells us, " It is evident that the Government of the Church by Episcopacy, was of Apostolical Institution,



"tion, for that *Timothy* was made Bishop of *Ephesus*, and *Titus* of *Creet*, as  
 "is plain by *St. Paul's* Epistles to them both ; that the seven Churches of  
 "*Asia* which received the Christian Faith had each a Bishop is evident, by  
 "the Title *St. John* gives them in his Letters to them. This is the Gen-  
 tlemans proof of the Divine right of our English Prelacy, this is that mighty  
 evidence and demonstration, he so often refers to in his Pamphlet, saying,  
 I have proved, I have shewed, &c.

But if it was so plain from *St. Paul's* Epistles that *Timothy* and *Titus* were  
 Bishops, why did he not tell us what words those are which make it so very  
 plain? Indeed the Postscripts to those Epistles, expressly call them Bishops  
 of *Ephesus* and *Creet*, but does he need to be told, that the Postscripts are no  
 part of Canonical Scripture, nor joined with the Epistles for several hun-  
 dred years after Christ; *Theodoret* being the first that mentions them, only  
 as part of his own Commentary, and yet he has not the word Bishop in them;  
 Nor any body else till *Oecumenius* who wrote above a thousand years after  
 Christ: nay the very Postscripts themselves prove that they are of much  
 later date than the Epistles, for in one of them *Phrygia* is called *Pacatiana*,  
 which was not the name of it till above three hundred years after Christ, when  
 it was conquered by one *Pacatius* a Roman General, and after him called  
*Pacatiana*; and in the Postscript to *Titus*, it is said the Epistle was writ from  
*Nicopolis*, which it could not be, since in the Epistle it self, *Paul* speaks of  
*Nicopolis* a place whither he designed to go and Winter, and would have  
*Titus* come to him there; come to me to *Nicopolis*, for there ( not here ) I  
 design to Winter; these Postscripts therefore betray themselves by their own  
 language.

And he should have told us, what there is in the word Angel that will de-  
 monstrate a Diocesan Bishop, but instead thereof tells us a long story out of  
*Dr. Hammond*, which is worse than impertinent, for it affirms that those  
 Angels were not Diocesan Bishops, but Metropolitans, or Arch-Bishops,  
 that had Bishops under them; now our learned Church Men acknowledge  
 that Metropolitans, are not of Divine, but of Ecclesiastical Institution, and  
 have no proper Jurisdiction over Bishops, and they generally desert Doctor  
*Hammond* in this Notion, but this Gentleman had not considered so far, but  
 found a large Paragraph, that would prove the largeness of those Churches,  
 and thought he had got a prize; in short let them but acknowledge Presby-  
 ters to be Bishops, as *Dr. Hammond* says they all were in Scripture Times,  
 and let the Bishops be Metropolitans, holding only by Ecclesiastical Institu-  
 tion, without any proper Authority over the Presbyters, and we shall not  
 much differ from them.

Let us now see what evidence may be brought to prove that Presbyters  
 are of the same Order with Bishops, and have the same power as they. And

*Vid. Dr. Sher-  
lock Vindic.  
of Prot.  
Princ. p. 71.*

*Dr. Morrice  
of Diocesan  
Episcop.  
p. 27.*

1st. It is no contemptible argument that Presbyters are frequently called  
 Bishops in Scripture, that the names are used promiscuously the greatest Pa-

trons of the Prelacy acknowledge; the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus* are so called *Acts* 20. 28. The Ministers of the Church of *Philippi* are called Bishops; and it is observable that the Syriack Version, which is very antient, has but one word for Presbyter and Bishop; now if there be so material a difference betwixt a Bishop and a Presbyter, as some men would make, it is strange there should not be a distinct word to express it by: if only such as are now owned to be Bishops were called Presbyters, the argument would not be so strong, for they might think to evade it by saying, the lesser is included in the greater, and they are Presbyters before they are Bishops; but when even those who are acknowledged to be meer Presbyters, are called Bishops, it is very considerable, for the lesser cannot include the greater; it would sound very strange in *England* for a Presbyter to write himself Bishop: and if the Apostles had known any thing of this mighty distinction, upon which the Fate of so many Churches, and Salvation of so many Souls is made to depend, we cannot suppose they would have laid such a temptation before us, to draw us into an opinion of the Identity of Order, by the indifferent and promiscuous use of the Titles.

Dr. *Morrice* in his defence of Diocesan Episcopacy, makes very little account of the Title of Bishops being given to Presbyters in the Church of *Philippi*, and is pleased to say, "This debate about the Bishops of *Philippi* had soon been at an end, if our Author had thought fit to explain himself, and told us what he meant by Bishops, for were the Pastors of single Congregations respectively in Covenant? Then there must have been several Congregations or Churches in the same City, which Mr. *Clarkson* will not allow: Or were those Bishops only Presbyters ruling the Church of *Philippi* with common and equal authority? Then our Author must give up the question, and instead of making many Bishops, must own that there was none at all there but onely Presbyters, will he contend that there were no other Bishops than Presbyters? That will be to abuse his Reader with the Ambiguity of a Word, which he takes in one sense, and the Church in another, that many Presbyters might belong to one Congregation none ever denied, but that many Bishops in the Allow'd and Ecclesiastical sense of the Word, had the oversight of one City, seems strange and incredible to the Antient Christians. *Chrysostom* observing this expression of the Bishops of *Philippi*, seems to be startled with it; What many Bishops in one City? By no means, it cannot be, what then? They were not Bishops properly so called, but Presbyters.

Works of the  
Learned Au-  
gustin, p. 25.

I have taken the more notice of this Paragraph, because *La Croze* magnifies it as a terrible *Dilemma*, though he has lamentably spoiled it in the Abridgment; but taking it as the Dr. has laid it before us, I see not how it can much weaken our Cause or fortifie his own: We do really maintain that these Bishops were Presbyters, ruling the Church of *Philippi* with common consent, and whether this be the Ecclesiastical sense of the word or no, we are not much concerned to enquire; it is sufficient to our purpose that it is the true

Scriptural

Scriptural fence, and the only one too, for we never find the word in all the New Testament, signifying an Ecclesiastical Order of Men Superior to Presbyters; we deny not, but that this Name very early began to be appropriated to the Senior Presbyter in a Church or City, who yet never pretended to be a distinct Order from the rest of his Colleagues of the Presbytery for a long time afterwards. But as the word thus used, is taken in an Ecclesiastical, not Scriptural fence, so the Dignity thereby expressed, is of meer Ecclesiastical, not Divine Institution.

And whereas *Chrysostom* says, *They were not Bishops properly so called*; he can mean no more by it, but that they were not such Bishops as that word was made to signify by common usage in his time; and we grant they were not, for the Distinction of Office and Degree, not being known in Scripture, the word could not be used in that distinguishing fence there. Thus a Learned Canonist gives it as the Vogue of many Primitive Authors: "That Bishop and Presbyter were formerly the same, and that Presbyter was the Name of the Persons Age, Bishop of his Office, but there being many of these in every Church, they determined amongst themselves for the preventing of Schism, that one should be Elected by themselves to be set over the rest, and the Person so elected, retained the Name of Bishop for Distinction sake; the rest were only called Presbyters, and in process of time, their Reverence for these Bishops so increased, that they began to obey them as Children do a Father, &c."

*Lancel. Testif.  
Leg. Can. l. 1.  
Tit. 21. p. 32.*

2dly, Not only the same Title, but the same Powers are ascribed to Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture; both that of Jurisdiction and that of Orders, as they are usually distinguished. As to the former, we read of ruling Presbyters, *1 Tim. 5. 17. Let the Elders that Rule well be accounted worthy of double honour*; If this Rule be not the same with their Jurisdiction, where lies the difference? and where will they find as plain Scripture for the pretended Jurisdiction of Prelates, as here we have for the ruling Power of Presbyters? and that Admonition of the Apostle *Peter* is worthy our observation, *1 Pet. 5. 1, 2. The Presbyters which are amongst you I exhort, who am also a Presbyter, and a witness of the Sufferings of Christ—Feed the Flock of God which is amongst you, taking the Oversight thereof, &c.* The Spiritual Jurisdiction of Presbyters, is here express'd by two words, [*providere*] which the Defenders of the Hierarchy contend, does not signify barely to Feed, but to provide Food as the Governor of a Family, and is often used for Government, and sometimes that of Princes; but however it certainly signifies the office of a Pastor, and is a good Argument that the Pastoral Power is vested in Presbyters; The other word is [*intendere*] taking the oversight, or the Episcopal Office, doing the work of a Bishop; if this will not prove that the Episcopal Jurisdiction belongs to Presbyters, I despair of ever understanding the meaning of words.

The Power of Orders is with the same clearness attributed to Presbyters; *Timothy* himself, who they say was a Bishop, receives his Office or Gift by the

the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. To this the Gent. replies; Dr. *Hammond* says that those Presbyters were Apostles; but that is only the Doctors conjecture, and yet if the Apostles were concerned in it, it is plain, they acted as Presbyters, whether they were Apostles, or Bishops, or Evangelists, they acted as a Presbytery. I doubt not but if it had been said, *The Gift which thou receivest by the laying on of the hands of the Episcopacy*; these Gentlemen would have presently concluded that Ordination belongs to Bishops as such, and would have given us very hard words, if we should have dared to dispute it.

*Barnabas* and *Paul* themselves, who are called Apostles, received their Ordination from Prophets and Teachers, *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. and it is observable before this, neither of them were called Apostles; but presently after they were, *Chap.* 14. *Vers.* 14.

*Differt.* 4.  
*Cap.* 19, 20.  
*Vind of Differt.*  
*p.* 25.

These things have so gravel'd the Learned Defenders of Diocesan Prelacy, that they have not agreed amongst themselves how to find out a tolerable Evasion; but their most famous Doctors have taken quite contrary Paths. Dr. *Hammond* saw there was no way to come off, but by holding that all the Presbyters we read of in Scripture, were Bishops; and that there was no inferior Order instituted by the Apostles, but that presently after in *Ignatius's* time we meet with them. Now this is as much as we desire, for it fully proves that by Divine Right Bishops and Presbyters are the same, and that the distinction was not founded upon any Scripture Rule, but only an ancient Constitution: I perceive many have learnt out of Dr. *Hammond* to evade all these instances of the Powers given to Presbyters in Scripture, by saying, Those were not meer Presbyters; and when we ask them what they mean by meer Presbyters, they answer, such as were not also Bishops, and we grant they were not meer Presbyters if that be the signification of it, nor were there any such meer Presbyters in Scripture that we know of.

*Unreason. of*  
*separ.* p. 269.

Dr. *Stillingfleet* on the other hand says, That the Apostles in their times managed the Government of the Churches themselves, and therefore there was then no Bishop, but they were all one with Presbyters; but that as the Apostles went off, Bishops came to be settled in the several Churches. Now though it is most certain the Apostles did not manage the Government of particular Churches themselves, but put it into the hands of the Presbyters, they themselves still holding an Universal Superintendency; yet we gladly accept the Concession of this learned Prelate; 'tis indeed *à regione* adverse to Dr. *Hammond*, but will equally serve our purpose; the one says, there were no Presbyters in Scripture times inferior to Bishops; the other, there were no Bishops superior to Presbyters: Our conclusion flows alike naturally and freely from both, that in Scripture times Bishops and Presbyters were of the same Order.

3dly, We have no Rules laid down in Scripture for the Ordination of any Bishops but what are the same with Presbyters; in *1 Tim.* 3. we have the Qualifications of Bishops and Deacons described, and no mention made of

of Presbyters, because they were the same with the Bishops; and unless we acknowledge that, we shall be utterly at a loss for a Reason of that Omission; and there are few Commentators but understand it so: The learned *Grotius* upon this place says, the Presbyters of the Churches are here called Bishops or Inspectors, but that afterward that Name was given *καὶ ἑκείνῳ*, to one of them that was the *Πρόεδρος*, President.

*Titus* who was left in *Creet* to ordain Elders, has a Canon given him about the Qualifications of those Elders, *Cb. I. v. 5, 6.* and as a reason it is added, *For a Bishop must be blameless*; this would have been no reason, had not the Elder and Bishop been the same. A late Author thought this so considerable, that he puts a new fence upon the words *καλῶς ἰσχυρὸς καὶ πόλιν περισβύλλων*, ordain Elders in every City, as if the meaning were, advance Presbyters in every City to the Office of Bishops; but this is a stretch upon the word which it cannot bear, [*ἐπισκοπῶν*] plainly signifies to constitute and ordain, and when the Persons are mentioned, it is in the capacity to which they are ordain'd not from which they were advanced, as *Aristot. in Polit.* *ἐπισκοπῶν* ἢ ἀρχόντων, the instauration of Princes, and *Plutarch*, *ἀρχὰς ἐπισκοπῶν*, the Accusative Case if alone always representing the State unto which the *ἐπισκοπῶν*, had raised them; nor do I believe any one instance can be given to the contrary in either Sacred or Prophane Writer.

Now if this distinction of Order had been known in Apostolical times, it is very strange we should not have a distinct Rule for the Ordination of the one, and the Consecration of the other; especially since by the acknowledgment of all, it is not having many Congregations, or Presbyters under him that makes a Bishop, but only a peculiar, and higher Ordination: And yet we find no footsteps of it, but on the contrary, in the very Directory for Ordination of Presbyters, they are called Bishops: Surely these things are as clear proof that Bishops were not a Superior Order as a Negative is capable of, and there being no one Text in Scripture that affirms the distinction *Semper præsumitur pro negante*, we must have concluded in the Negative, though we had not had these proofs.

But what is wanting in Scripture, they hope to make up out of the Fathers and Councils, in behalf of Diocesan Prelacy; it is certain they think their greatest strength lies there: And we deny not that many of the Fathers seem to make a great difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters; but this does not overthrow our Hypothesis; for if they are the same in Scripture, the Sayings of the Fathers cannot make them otherwise, and yet few or none of the Ancients say that they are distinct Orders, much less that they are so by divine right; but some of them acknowledge the contrary, as we shall presently shew.

It is not therefore their using the Name of Bishop in a sense distinct from that of Presbyter, or requiring Presbyters to be obedient to their Bishop, that will prove a superiority of order *jure divino*; for we grant that it was the early Practice of the Church to choose one of the Gravest and Wisest



of the Presbyters, and constitute him President over the rest; and that where there were many Presbyters in a particular Church, commonly the Eldest or worthiest was as Pastor, and the other his Assistants, but still we know the Parson and the Curates are of the same order; and every Bishop in England is equal in order to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, though they take an Oath of Canonical Obedience to him; the same we say of the distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter in Primitive Times.

This would be a sufficient reply unto the Antiquities this Gentleman has alledged, but lest he should think he has done a mighty feat in transcribing these Passages, I shall animadvert more particularly upon them.

He begins with the Canons of the Apostles, but why they should take place of *Clemens Romanus* and *Ignatius*, I cannot tell, unless he has a Mind to cheat us with the Name, or was cheated by it himself. Dr. *Cave* reckons them among the Supposititious Works of the First Age; and Dr. *Beveridge*, who has laboured so hard to defend them against *Daille*, only contends that they were written by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, near the latter End of the Second Century. But what say these Canons? why they say, "Let not the Presbyters or Deacons do any thing without the consent of the Bishop," for he hath the People of the Lord entrusted to him, and there shall one day be required of him an Account of their Souls. Here (says the Gentleman) the Bishop has the Power of governing the Presbyters and Deacons; it is well argued however; the Kings of England can make no Laws without the consent of the Lords and Commons, have they therefore the power of governing him? *Cyprian* did nothing without the concurrence of his Presbyters; nay, he determined to do nothing without the consent of his People; by our Gentleman's dialect the Presbyters and People had the Power of governing the Bishop.

*Concil. Carth.*  
c. 23.  
*Cypr. Edit.*  
*Goul. Ep. 6.*  
p. 17.  
*Ep. 24. p. 55.*

And is there one word here to prove that the Bishop was of a Superior Order? The Curates of a Church are to have the direction and consent of the Parson, and yet the Order is the same; And it deserves to be considered whether 'tis likely this Bishop the Canon speaks of, was any more than the Pastor of a particular Church, since he must be supposed capable of giving the Necessary Orders for management of all Affairs, and nothing must be done without his consent; it would be a Rule hard to be observed, as our present Dioceses are Modell'd; and if Presbyters must do nothing without the Bishops consent, they must do nothing at all, the whole time being too little for Travel and Consultation, there would be none left for Action; unless by consent, we must understand a general Permission to do what they please, without consulting him at all in particular Matters, which would be a very odd Comment upon such a Text, and not very well agreeing with the Reason that is added for this consent, viz. That the Bishop has the People of the Lord committed to him, and shall give an account of their Souls. Surely this requires a more careful and near inspection, than to commit the care of all by an Act of general consent to others, without ever intending a personal

personal Acquaintance with one of a Thousand, so solemnly committed to Prof. Taylor's *Respect*. him. Dr. Taylor says he is sure we cannot give an Account of those Souls of whom we have no notice.

The next passage is out of *Clement Romanus* his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, a Piece of Antiquity which all the World has a great Veneration for; that which the Gentleman thinks is for his purpose, he gives us thus; "The Apostles foreseeing that there would be Contentions about the Name or Dignity of Bishop or Episcopacy, they set down a List or Continuation of Successors, that when any died, such a certain person should succeed him."

But this place in *Clement* is very falsely recited, and whoever furnished him with it abused him, and imposed upon his Ignorance. This Translator whoever he be, would have us to think that the Apostles set down a List of the Names of those that were to Succeed in the Episcopal See; this we cannot admit, until he tell us where this List is to be found? how far it went? It seems it was a Continuation of Successors, but it is hard to imagine how they could have the Names of Persons so ready, that were yet unborn, and unconverted; we know an Infallible Spirit could reveal it to them, but surely then we should have had it in the Canon of Scripture; such a thing would have been of singular Use, not only for prevention of Disputes about the choice of Bishops, but for the Uncontrovertible Evidence of the Truth of Christianity, when they were able to produce a Prophetical List, with the Names of Persons then unborn, and yet all in due time appearing, and ascending the Chair according to that Sacred Roll: for these Reasons we cannot but reject the Fiction of any such List of Names, which when one died, declared that such a certain Person should succeed him.

And I am sure the words of *Clement* say no such thing; the true English of them is this: And our Apostles understood by our Lord Jesus that contention would arise about the Name of Episcopacy, and for this Cause being furnished with perfect foreknowledge, ordained those before-mentioned, and moreover gave [*ἐπινομήσαντες*] order, that whensoever they should die, other approved Men should succeed and perform their Functions.

I know there have been great Disputes about this odd word *ἐπινομήσαντες*, Bishop Usher renders it [*Ordinem*] those that translate it [*a List*] would have it *ἐπινομήσαντες*. But let them contend about words as long as they please, the true import of the place, is plain enough to those that consider it with the foregoing Paragraph; for there we find the Jewish Contests about the Priesthood, and those of the Christians about the Episcopacy are compared together; the case may be thus contracted, *Moses* knowing that the Tribes would contend about the glorious Title of the Priesthood, ordered them to bring their Rods, each inscribed with the Name of its Tribe, and he laid them up in the Tabernacle, telling them, That the Tribe whose Rod should blossom God had approved and chosen for the Priesthood; Even so the Apostles, &c. That is, as the Sacerdotal Tribe was chosen and approved of God, so none must take upon them the office of Episcopacy, but Men well

Kad oi 'Απο-  
στολοι ημῶν  
ἐγγινώσκοντες  
τὴν κληρῶν, &c.  
Edit. Colonus.  
103.

ἐκείνος γὰρ  
ἐκείνην ἡμετέραν  
ἐκείνην τὴν  
ἐκείνην, &c.  
P. 100.

approved; this seems to me the true sense of the place, and the only one that it is capable of.

P. 98.

And what is here to prove that Bishops are a distinct Order from Presbyters, not one word, but rather to the contrary; for here it is said the Apostles constituted τὸ ἐπισκοπικόν, the aforesaid, go a few lines backward and you have the word again, and there you will find it refers to Bishops and Deacons, which the Apostles ordained for those that should believe: Now, if they only appointed these two sorts of Officers, what is become of subordinate Presbyters? the Apostles we see appointed none such, the distinction betwixt Bishops and Presbyters according to *Clement*, is not by Divine or Apostolical institution; and it is observable, that in this very Paragraph he makes them the same, *ἐπισκοπὰ δὲ ἡ μὲν ἐστὶν ἡμετέρα, &c.* "It will be no small Sin in us to reject those that have discharged the Duties of their Episcopal Function in an holy and unblameable manner, happy are those Presbyters who have finished their course—They fear not being turned out of their present Settlement.

Epist. 182. ad Bignon.

It is strange these Gentlemen should threaten us with *Clement*, who as he writ next to the Apostles, so he is next to them most friendly to our Cause, and this was so evident to the learned *Grotius*, That he gives it as a reason why he thinks this Epistle to be Genuine, "*Quod nusquam meminit excommunicatū, &c.*" because he nowhere mentions that extravagant Authority of Bishops "which by the Custom of the Church began to be introduced at *Alexandria*, but plainly shews as the Apostle does, that Churches were governed by the Common Council of Presbyters who were also Bishops.

Ep. ad Philad.

His next Author is *Ignatius*, and it must be confessed, he puts a distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, and bids them all be observant of the Bishop, and do nothing without the consent of the Bishop; but still here is not a word to prove a Superiority of Office by divine right; we grant that in his time the Name of Bishop began to be appropriated to the Senior Presbyter, who was as Pastor, and the rest his Curats or Assistants, but this will make little for the Diocesan Prelate; That *Ignatius's* Bishop was no more than the Pastor of a particular Church, his own words abundantly manifest; *Ἐν ὑμετέσταις, μὴν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι ὡς αὐτὸν ἀποστόλους καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς τοὺς συνδούλους μὲν.* There is to every Church one Altar, and one Bishop, with the Presbytery and the Deacons my Fellow-Servants; here we have the principle of Individuation in Churches, not that all the Members of the Church, must be no more than can always meet together in one place, there be many things that may make that difficult, but they must all have One Altar, that is, One Communion-Table; Many Tricks and Salvo's have been invented to evade this instance; some say by One Table, is meant specifically One; but so, are all in the World. Others, One Supreme Altar, to which the rest were Subordinate; but why then may we not say, by One Bishop, is meant One Supreme Prelate, with other Bishops under him? There is no reason assignable, why the *ἐπίσκοπος*, should be taken Numerically, and the

the *W. Swinckew*, otherwise. That by One Altar, is meant One Consistory; as Dr. *Morrice* would suggest, is very improbable, when in the same Sentence we read of One Bishop with his Presbytery, which sure must signify the Consistory, if any thing that Sentence does, and is much more likely to do so, than One Altar.

This is so apparent, that Mr. *Mede* confesses, "It should seem that in those first times before Diocesan were divided into lesser and subordinate Churches, we now call Parishes, and Presbyters assigned to them, they had not only one Altar in one Church or *Dominicum*, but one Altar to a Church, taking a Church for the Company or Corporation of the faithful, united under one Bishop, and that was in the City and place where the Bishop had his Residence. Dr. *Morrice* would disable this Evidence; because Mr. *Mede* expresses it with Caution and Modesty, *it should seem*. But such modesty makes it more valuable, being the humor and way of that learned man; he had made as strict researches into these things, as he could, and upon the whole it seemed thus to him, but if there was a more than ordinary Caution, observed in the Words, some will be apt to think, it was not for want of evidence, that the case was really so, but rather because he knew the Notion would not be very agreeable to the Governours of that Church of which he was an Excellent Member.

The Author of a late Treatise, called a *Defence of Pluralities*, supposed to be Mr. *Wharton*, notwithstanding the heights of his Zeal for the Hierarchy, which appear sufficiently throughout the Book, yet ingenuously acknowledges, "That at the beginning, the Bishop and his Presbyters lived altogether in one common place, and were maintain'd by the free Oblations of the People which were brought to the Cathedral and deposited upon the Altar or Communion Table, when the number of Christians encreased they began to build more Churches than one in a City, these new Churches were but as Chappels of Ease, annexed to and depending upon the Cathedral Church, where the Holy Eucharist was Consecrated.

This may suffice to shew what kind of Diocess, *Ignatius's* Bishop had, and what he means by one Altar; and a late Author has said a great deal to prove out of *Ignatius* himself, that the several Bishopricks of *Smyrna*, *Epbesus*, *Magnesia*, *Philadelphia* and *Trallium*, were but so many single Congregations, governed by a Bishop as Pastor and his Presbyters as Assistants, and this he makes the true distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter in those times: But whether that be so or no is not so material, as that our Cause cannot stand without it; for as the first variation from Apostolical Practice, was the setting up of one above the rest of the Presbyters, in a particular Church, and calling him Bishop, so the next was the keeping of new Congregations in dependancy upon that which was the first Church; and though I will not say such dependances are in all Cases unlawful, yet they are ordinarily dangerous, and can never be proved necessary; God has no where tied up a new formed Congregation, from endeavouring to have a Bishop and Altar of their own;

*Proof of Churches in the second Cent. p. 29.*

Page 59.

*Enquiry into the Constitution. Discip. Unity, Sec. Of the Primitive Church. Chap. 2.*



own; and if this cannot be had with the good Will and Consent of that Elder Church and Bishop, who had been instrumental in the Conversion of this new Colony, they may, no doubt, do it without them, if general Edification require it.

Thus I have briefly examined our Gentlemans Antiquities, what Advantage he or his Cause has received by them, he has now leisure to consider; Let us see whether the Primitive Fathers are no more favourable to us than they have been to him. And I would lay down this, as a just remark upon these proofs out of Antiquity, That, one Passage which expressly tells us, what kind of Superiority, Bishops had in Primitive times over Presbyters, and how they came by it, is of more value in this Controversie, than a score, that barely mention that Superiority; the one speaks directly to the Question, the other not; we acknowledge those whom the Fathers call Bishops, had some kind of Superiority, over those called Presbyters, and it is a vain thing for Persons to sweat and toil, in proving that which we never deny, but will grant them at the first demand, but the Controversie turning upon this very hinge, whether it was a Superiority of Order by Divine Institution, those Ancients that speak purposely to this Point, are the most proper Evidences in this cause.

St. Hierom speaks as directly to the Question, as 'tis possible for one to do; he positively asserts, and largely proves, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same, *Ad Evagrian.* "*Manifestissime comprobatur eundem esse Episcopum & Presbyterum*"; and citeth for that purpose, *Acts* 20. 28. *Phil.* 1. 1. *Tit.* 1. 5, 6, 7. And divers other Texts of Scripture, and in his Commentary on "*1st of Titus* affirms, *Idem ergo Presbyter qui Episcopus*, &c. and tells us, that "at first the Churches were governed by the common consent of the Presbyters, and that the Distinction betwixt Presbyter and Bishop was, *Ma-*

*Ep. ad Heliodorum.* p. 283.

*gis consuetudine quam dispositionis Dominica veritate*, rather by Custom than Divine Appointment — in another place he ascribes to Presbyters the Power of the Keys; and is so full and express, that some of the Papists accuse him of Error herein; others labour hard, but in vain, to invalidate his evidence by pretending, that this Prælation of Bishops, above Presbyters, was a thing done by Apostolical Appointment, because *Jerom* says, it was found out as a remedy against Schism, when men began to say I am of *Paul* and I of *Apollo*, which was in the Apostles times; but to this it has been often replied, St. *Jerom* does not speak of that particular Schism of the *Corinthians*, but of others which arose about Confests of the like Nature; and that he does not intend that individual Case of the Church of *Corinth*, is most certain. For,

1. The Schisms he speaks of, were occasioned by their differences about those Presbyters, that had governed them by common Consent; but that of the *Corinthians* was about the Apostles, it cannot be supposed, that by the common Council of Presbyters; *Jerom* should mean, *Paul*, *Apello*, and *Cephas* governing in Common the Church of *Corinth*.

2. This Schism *Jerom* speaks of, was too much promoted, by the Presbyters



byters themselves, *Postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos esse putabat, non Christi, &c.* He does not date this Distinction of Order, from the time that the People only contended about their Ministers, but when the Ministers also, influenced those Contentions, and made themselves the Heads of Parties, accounting those their own who had been baptized by them; now this was not the *Corinthian* case, for there the Apostle was so far from encouraging those sidings, that he expressly condemns them.

3. The Schism he speaks of, was remedied by choosing one of those Presbyters they contended about; and setting him over the rest, and committing the whole care of the Church to him, but I hope none will say, that *Paul* was set above *Cephas*, or he above *Paul*, or *Apollo* above them both, to heal the *Corinthians* Schism; and therefore the rise of Prelacy is not to be dated from that very Schism; but from others, that afterwards happened in the Churches.

And it has been observed by a very learned Doctor, That the Arguments which *St. Jerom* brings for this Parity, are grounded upon those parts of Scripture, which were writ after this *Corinthian* Schism, and says he, can we think *Jerom* had so little sense, as to say that Episcopacy was instituted upon that Schism, and yet bring all his Arguments for Parity after the time that he sets for the Institution of Episcopacy?

*St. Ambrose* or rather *Hilary*, affirms that the Ordination that was in the Church in his day, did not exactly agree with the writings of the Apostles, and afterward shews, how the difference betwixt a Bishop and Presbyter arose, by a meer Act of the Church choosing One that was most worthy, and setting him over the Rest, but that in the beginning there were no particular Rectors of Churches constituted, and therefore all things were managed, by the Convention of Presbyters, *Comment* in *1 Cor. 11.* These Commentaries are cited by *St. Augustine* and greatly commended.

*Clement Alexandrinus*, *Stromat. l. 7.* tells us, that the Discipline of the Church, is *Penes Presbyteros*, in the Power of the Presbyters.

*St. Augustine* gives us a plain account of the difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, *Secundum honorum Vocabula, quæ jam Ecclesia usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major est*; he does not pretend that it was by Divine right, but by the Custom of the Church, nor in any real act of Power, but only in an honourary Title that Episcopacy is Superiour to Presbytery.

And this matter is so evident, that the most learned Papists acknowledge it was the opinion of most of the Fathers, *Cassander* is positive in it, *Convenit inter omnes olim Apostolorum ætate nullum discrimen, &c.*

To this, some Object, that both *Jerom* and *Crisostome*, notwithstanding all they say for the Identity of these Offices, do still except Ordination, as that which is peculiar to the Bishop, but the illustrious *Chamier* has sufficiently taken off this Objection, *Agere de sui temporis potestis non de ea quæ fuit ab Ecclesia initiis*, and more particularly to that of *Jerom*, *manifestum est de suo loqui tempore, &c.* "It is manifest, when *St. Jerom* says, a Pres-

*Non per omnia  
Mediant  
Scripta Aposto-  
li ordiat, in  
Ephes. 4.  
Presbiteri  
Concilio ut non  
ordo, sed meri-  
tam crearet E-  
piscopum malto-  
rum sacerdot. ju-  
dicio censit. l.  
bid.*

*Medinas de  
sacr. Rom. O-  
rig. l. 1. c. 2.  
Consult. Art.  
14. p. 952.  
Cory. Hom.  
11.*

*Chamier de Or-  
can. Paris.  
cap. 6. p. 180.*

byter

"byter does every thing that a Bishop does, except in Ordination, he speaks  
 "of the time in which he lived, and from that very thing he draws an Ar-  
 "gument to prove, that formerly Bishop and Presbyter were the same, be-  
 "cause, says he even now, though the Names have been for a long time  
 "used for Distinction of Degrees, yet excepting in Ordination, there is no-  
 "thing that a Bishop does but a Presbyter may do it also; and therefore if  
 "after so long a Discrimination of Title and Degree, Bishops have only  
 "gained this one Point of Power, it is certain at first there was no diffe-  
 "rence at all; this is the reasoning of that Father, wherein he agrees very  
 "well with himself, and is guilty of no such inconsistency as some careless or  
 "prejudiced Readers would charge upon him.

But that which seems most directly to confront these Witnesses is, That  
*Aerius* is reckon'd amongst the Hereticks by *Epiphanius*, for 'this Opinion,  
 and is represented as a Prodigy, and his Opinion madness, which Dr. *Mor-  
 rice* does not forget to Proclaim, as that which gives a mortal wound to our  
 Cause.

But a learned Prelate of their own, will give them a sufficient answer to  
*Irenic*. p. 277. this, for if *Aerius* was a Heretick for holding the Identity of Order, it is  
 strange that *Epiphanius*, should be the first man, that should charge him with  
 it, and that neither *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret* nor *Evagrius* before whose  
 time he lived, should censure him for it; and why should not *Jerom* have  
~~been~~ equally Animadverted upon, who is as express in this as any man in the  
 World. But some tell us, He was an *Arian*, others say, he was put amongst  
 the Hereticks for making an unnecessary Separation from the Church of *Se-  
 bastia*, and *Eustathius* the Bishop thereof; not that this was indeed Heresie,  
 but it was the custom of angry Bishops in those Ages to call all men Here-  
 ticks that stood in their way, as appears by the famous Catalogues of Here-  
 ticks and Heresies, that *Philastrius* a Bishop and Saint has bequeathed unto  
 the World.

It is too evident to be concealed, that *Epiphanius*, though otherwise a  
 Worthy and Good Man, was of a hot and eager Temper, rash in his Cen-  
 sures, and sometimes transported into great irregularities of Practice, as ap-  
 pears by the disturbance he made at *Constantinople*, and the rude Language  
*Socratus*, c. 11, he gave to *Chrysostom*, because he did not at his command, banish *Diosco-  
 rus* and condemn the Books of *Origen*.  
 12.

The Learned Author of the Summary of the Controversies between the  
 Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, gives us an instance of the  
 rash and injudicious Zeal of *Epiphanius*, in condemning *Aerius* for Heresie  
 in another point, which will very much depreciate the Authority of that Fa-  
 ther in judging of Heresies; take it in the Words of our Author. "At the  
*Summary of the* "Celebration of the Eucharist, the Bishop or Priest made mention of the  
*Controv.* p. 62. "Names of Martyrs, and Confessors, and those who had deserved well of  
 63, 64. "the Church, and particular Christians in their Private Devotions, remem-  
 "bered their own Relations and Friends, and thus it became a Custom with-  
 "out

“out enquiring into the Reasons of it, till by this Custom, People began to conclude, that such Prayers were profitable for the dead, and that those who had not lived so well as they should do, might obtain the pardon of their Sins by the Intercessions of the Living; which I confess, was a very natural Thought, and shews us the easie progress of Superstition, that Customs taken up without any good Reason, will find some reason, though a very bad one when they grow Popular; upon this *Aerius* condemns the Practice, and he is reckoned amongst Hereticks for so doing; He desired to know for what Reason, the Names of dead men are recited in the Celebration of the Eucharist, and Prayers made for them, whether by this means those who died in Sin might obtain Pardon, which he thought if it were true would make it unnecessary to live virtuously, if they had Pious Friends who would pray for them, when they were dead; *Epiphanius* undertakes to confute *Aerius*, but gives such Reasons, as are no answer at all to his Questions. He says it signifies our Belief, that those who are dead to this World do still live in another state, are alive to God; That it signifies our good Hopes of the Happy State of those who are gone hence; That it is done to make a Distinction between Christ, and all other good Men, for we pray for all but him, who intercedes for us all. Very worthy Reasons of praying for the Dead, &c.

Thus you see what a Monstrous Heretick *Aerius* was, and what an admirable Confuter *Epiphanius*; The Truth is, these two Heresies of *Aerius* concerning the Parity of Bishops and Presbyters, and the unlawfulness of praying for the dead, are much of the same Nature; and *Epiphanius*'s Confutation of them both, equally Learned and Satisfactory; for it is very observable that in the same place where he condemns that monstrous prodigious Heresie of the Identity of Order, he fairly confesses, “That by the two Orders of Presbyters and Deacons, all Ecclesiastical Offices might be per-  
 “formed, *πρεσβυτεριον ὃ ἐστὶν τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ διακόνου, διὰ ὃς τὸ νό τῶν τοῦ ἐκκλη-*  
 “*σιαστικῆς διακονίας ἀναρτῶνται.*

*Epiph. cont.*  
*Actum he-*  
*ris. 75. p. 905.*

After the Fathers, we have suffrage of the Canonists, *Gratian*, cap. 24. *Legimus*, dist. 39. cap. 5. *Olim*, dist. 95. cap. 4. *Nullus*, dist. 60. cap. 16. *Eccle*, dist. 95. *Lancel*. l. 1. Tit. 21. p. 32. And it being thus enrolled in the Canon Law, was publicly taught by the Schoolmen and others, as *Lombard*, lib. 4. *Sentent*. dist. 24. *litera* l. But at length the Roman Church saw it necessary for the better settling of the Papacy to advance the Order of Episcopacy above Presbytery, and in the Council of *Trent* they have Decreed, *Sess*. 23. cap. 4. *Can*. 6, 7. this Superiority, and in their New Edition of the Canon Law have inserted this Note. “That Bi-  
 “shops have differed from Presbyters always, as they do now in Govern-  
 “ment, Prelacy, Offices and Sacraments, but not in the Name and Title of  
 “Bishop, which was formerly common to both. And those Learned Examiners of the *Tridentine* Council, *Chemnitzius* and *Gentilletus*, the one a Di-  
 vine, the other a Lawyer, condemn this Decree, the one by Scripture and  
 Fathers, the other by the Canon Law.

*Auth. Glossa*  
*in cap. dist.*  
*Council. Basil.*  
*Quarta de sac.*  
*Eccle. Min. l.*  
*1. c. 7.*

*Ann. Marg.*  
*ad Cap. legi-*  
*mas, dist. 43.*

*Exam. part 2.*  
*Lih. 4.*

The

The Judgment of the Reformed Churches, is so well known by the Harmony of Confessions, that I shall not particularly enlarge upon it, we have it there laid down, as the common Sentiments of the Churches of *Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germany, Hungary* and the *Low Countries*, that Bishops, and Presbyters, are by Divine Institution the same; and though some of those Churches, admit a kind of Episcopacy, yet they never pretend a *Jus Divinum* for it, but acknowledge it to be only a Prudential Constitution; but I know the Humor of some Men, has led them to despise the Reformed Churches and to condemn and unchurch them too, I shall therefore more distinctly shew, what has been the Judgment of our Learned Country Men concerning this Question.

*Calixtus Sedulius Scotus*, who flourished about the year of our Lord, 390, falls in with the opinion, and the very words of *Jerom*, *Expos. Tit. cap. 1.* and citing *Acts 20. 17.* bids us observe, how the Apostle calling the Elders *Fuisse Presbyt.* of but one City *Ephesus*, doth afterwards stile them Bishops, which thing *quasi Episc.* says he, I have alledged to shew that among the Antients, Presbyters were the same with Bishops.

*Alcuin de div. Offic. cap. 35.* *Venerable Bede* speaking of these things, says, *Conjunctus est gradus & in Multis pene Similis, in Acta Apost. cap. 20.* *Tom. 5. Col. 657.* *Anselme* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* above 600 years ago, a man so Learned that for his Confutation of the Greeks in the Council of *Bari in Apuleia*, he was dignified to sit at the Popes right Foot, is wholly with us in this Point, *Constat Enarr. in Ep. ergo Apostolica institutione omnes Presbyteros esse Episcopos*, and speaks in the *ad Philip.* Words of *Jerom*, *Sciant Episcopi se magis consuetudine, &c.*

And before him the Canons of *Elfrick*, Anno 990. speaking of Bishops and Presbyters say, *Unum tenent eundemq; Ordinem.* *Spelman Concil. Tom. 1. P. 570.*

*Rich. Armachanus* a Learned Prelate, *de Questionibus Armenorum*, cap. 2. affirms that the Degrees of Patriarch, Arch-Bishop and Bishop were invented by the Devotion of Men, not instituted by Christ, and that no Prelate how great soever hath any greater Degree of the Power of Order than a simple Presbyter, and in the 4th. Chap. he proves by *Acts 7. 14. 1 Tim. 4.* That the Power of Confirmation and Imposition of Hands belongs to the Jurisdiction of the Presbyter; and declares that Presbyters succeed the Apostles, and makes all the distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter to be this, he that hath a Cure is a Bishop, he that hath not is a Presbyter, which agrees with *Of the Church, Dr. Fields* Notion of Episcopal Jurisdiction, and also with that of the *Impartial Enquirer* into the Government of the Primitive Church, before mentioned. *L. 15. c. 27.*

Come we now to our Reformers, *John Wickliffe*, called by Mr. *Fox* the English Apostle, speaks thus, "Some multiply the Characters in Orders, but "one thing I confidently averr, that in the Primitive Church in *Pauls* time, "two Orders sufficed, the Presbyter and the Deacon, then was not invented the distinction of Pope and Cardinals, Patriarchs and Arch-Bishops, "Bishops, Arch-Deacons, Officials and Deans, with other Officers of which "there



"there is neither Number nor Order, that every one of these is an Order; and that in the receiving thereof there is a Character imprinted, as ours Babbie, it seems good to me to be silent, because they prove not what they affirm, it is sufficient to me if there be Presbyters and Deacons, keeping the State and Office that Christ hath imposed upon them; *Quia certum videtur quod superbia Caesaris hos gradus & ordines adinvenit*; because it seems certain to me that Imperious Pride hath invented these other Orders and Degrees.

In the Year, 1537. The Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* and *York*, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, whose Names are all subscribed to their Book intitled, The Institution of a Christian Man, Dedicated to the King and ratified by the Statute of 32. Hen. 8. thus determine; "The Truth is that in the New Testament, there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in Orders, but only of Deacons or Ministers, and of Priests or Bishops, and of these two Orders, that is to say, Priests and Deacons, Scripture maketh express mention, &c.

The Judgment of Arch-Bishop *Cranmer* as Dr. *Stillingfleet* reports it *ex ipso Autographo*, was, that Bishops and Priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one Office, in the beginning of Christ's Religion, *Irenic.* p. 392.

That Godly Martyr Mr. *Bradford*, in his Conference with Dr. *Harpfield*, avers, that the Scripture knows no difference betwixt Bishops and Ministers, that is, Priests, and when *Harpfield* asked him, Were not the Apostles, Bishops, answered no, unless you'll give a new Definition of a Bishop, that is, give him no certain place.

*Acts and Monuments*, Vol. 3. p. 293.

*Thomas Beacon* a Prebendary of *Canterbury*, and Refugee for Religion in Queen *Maries* Reign, in his Catechism Printed at *London*, and Dedicated to both Arch-Bishops, puts the Question, *What difference is there betwixt a Bishop and a Presbyter*? And Answers, None at all, their Office is the same, their Authority and Power is One, therefore St. *Paul* calls Ministers sometimes Bishops, sometimes Presbyters, sometimes Pastors, sometimes Doctors.

Dr. *Bridges* Dean of *Salisbury*, afterward Bishop of *Oxford*, in his Book P. 359, 360. called The Supremacy of Christian Princes, endeavours to clear *Aerius* from the charge of Heresie in this matter, and thus replies upon *Stapleton*, "For some who lived in the same Age with *Epiphanius*, will tell you, or if you have not read him your own Canons will tell you, *Idem est ergo Presbyter qui Episcopus, & antequam Diaboli Studia*, &c. This was the Judgement of the Antient Fathers, and yet they were no Arians nor Aerians therefore, and then cites *Lombard* and *Durandus*, and thus summs up the whole: "That in Substance, Order, or Character as they call it, there is no difference between a Priest and a Bishop; That the difference is but of accidents and circumstances, That in the Primitive times this difference was not known, &c.

*Instructio*



Defence of  
the Apology,  
Part. 2. C. 9.  
Divis. I.

Dr. Jewel, That most excellent Bishop of Salisbury, brings in Mr. Harding, alleging that they which denied the distinction of a Bishop and Priest were condemned of Heresie, as we find in St. *Austine*, and *Epiphanius*, and the Council of *Constance*; to which he answers in the Margent: "Untruth, for hereby both St. *Paul*, and St. *Jerome*, and other good men are condemned of Heresie; and afterwards says farther, Is it so horrible an Heresie as he maketh it, to say that by the Scriptures, a Bishop and Priest are all one? Or knoweth he how far, or to whom, he reacheth the name of a Heretick? Verily *Cyrisostome* saith, between a Bishop and a Priest in a manner there is no difference, St. *Jerome* saith somewhat in rougher sort, I hear say there is one become so peevish, that he setteth Deacons before Priests, that is before Bishops, whereas the Apostle plainly teacheth us that the Priests and Bishops be all one. St. *Austin* saith, what is the Bishop but the first Priest? So saith St. *Ambrose* there is but one Consecration of a Priest and Bishop, for both of them are Priests, but the Bishop is the first. Thus he.

Contr. DAVENUM  
l. 6. § 19.  
de Eccl. Re-  
gim. qd. 1.  
Cap. 1.  
de notis Ecclis.  
quest. 5.

The next I shall mention is Dr. *Whitaker* *Regius* Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge: He repeats St. *Jeromes* words at large on 1 *Titus*, and to *Evagrius*, that Bishops and Presbyters were the same, that the Primitive Churches were governed by the common consent of the Presbyters, that this custom was not changed by the Apostles, but afterwards by the Church, and thus argues. "If the Apostles had changed the order as *Sanders* pretendeth, what had it advantaged him to have so diligently collected Testimonies, out of the Apostles to prove that they were sometimes the same? He might easily have remembred, that the Order was changed by the Apostles themselves, after the Church was distracted with contentions, if any such thing had been done, (and he enquires) Wherefore then saith *Jerome*, Before it was said, I am of *Paul*, &c. He answers, This might deceive *Sanders*, but it is certain *Jerome* onely studeth to that place of the Apostle to shew that Schisms were the Cause of changing the Order, but this Remedy was almost worse than the Disease, for as at first one Presbyter was set above the rest, and made a Bishop, afterwards one Bishop was preferred before the Rest, and this custom at length produced the Pope with his Monarchy; and elsewhere he thus speaks of *Atrius* his Heresie; And truly if to condemn Prayers for the Dead, and to make Bishop and Presbyter equal be Heretical, *Nihil Catholicum esse potest*, nothing can be Orthodox and Catholick.

Resp. ad de-  
cin. rationem  
Campiani. p.  
13.

Treat of  
Schism, p. 13.

That passage in Mr. *Hales* of *Eaton* is as memorable as its Author. "They do but abuse themselves and others, that would persuade us, that Bishops by Christs institution, have any superiority over men further than Reverence, or that any is superior to another further than positive order agreed upon among Christians hath prescribed; Nature and Religion agree in this, that neither of them hath any hand in the Heraldry of *Secundum*, *sub* & *supra*, all this comes from composition and agreement of Men among themselves,

\* themselves, wherefore this abuse of Christianity to make it Lacquey to Ambition, is a Vice for which I have no extraordinary name of Ignominy, and an ordinary one I will not give it, lest you should take so transcendent a Vice to be but trivial.

The most Excellent Arch-bishop *Usher* both in his Writing and Discourse, acknowledged these Orders to be the same, that the difference was only in degree, that Bishops ordained as Presbyters, but regulated the Ordination as Bishops, and would not endure to hear the Ordination of the Reformed Churches condemned; In his *Reduction of Episcopacy* Printed by Dr. *Bernard*, he proves both by the words of *Paul*, of *Tertullian*, and the Order of the Church of *England*, that Spiritual Jurisdiction belongs to the Common Council of Presbyters, in which the Bishop is no more than President, and page 6. has these words. "True it is that in our Church this kind of Presbyterial Government hath been long disused, yet seeing it still professeth that every Pastor hath a right to rule the Church, from whence the name of Rector was also first given to him, and to administer the Discipline of Christ as well as to dispense the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the restraint of the exercise of that Right, proceedeth only from the Custom now received in the Realm, no man can doubt but by another Law of the Land this hindrance may be well removed.

And to say the Truth this was the general opinion of the Church of *England* for many years after the Reformation, and very few even of the Bishops themselves opposed it, Till the Treaties about Marriage with *Spain* and *France*, became the great occasion of corrupting the Court and Church, and letting in a sort of Men, who in pursuance of secret Articles were to effect an accommodation with *Rome*, and therefore must settle the *Jus Divinum* of the Prelacy, as the Council of *Trent* had done before them, by taking the power of opposition and dissent, out of the hands of the inferiour Clergy, who generally abhorred the design; from that time this new Doctrine has much grown upon the Nation, and with a great deal of noise and confidence has been asserted by the main bulk of the Ecclesiasticks, and yet some few of the most learned of them have declared against it, I shall onely mention two, both of eminent note and figure in the Church at this day, I mean the Bishops of *Worcester* and *Salisbury*.

For the Bishop of *Worcester*, I have cited his *Irenicum* so often already, that it would be in vain, to add any thing more, the main design of that learned Tract especially the latter part of it is to prove that God has not by his Law settled any form of Church Government: and he has for ever ruined the pretensions of Episcopacy to a *Jus Divinum*; they say indeed he has retracted that Book, but as long as he has not destroyed the reason of it, we are well enough, for it is upon the reason of the thing, not the authority of his person (how great soever) that we depend; and till that Book be undone as well as unsaid, it will remain in full force and virtue, for reason is always the same, though Men and their Interests may vary.

P. 2, 3.

Vid. Dr. *Hopkins*'s *Cyprianus Angl.*Mr. *Baxter* against a Revolt to a Foreign Jurisd. p. 25. & alibi.See also the late Bishop of *Hurford*'s Naked Truth.

Vindication  
of the Church  
of Scotland  
p. 306.

The Bishop of *Salisbury* inferior to none in all the accomplishments of a Gentleman, States-Man and Divine, spoke his thoughts freely, at a time when Prelacy was in its *Zenith*, thus "At first every Bishop had but one Parish, but afterwards when the numbers increased that they could not conveniently meet in one place, and when through the violence of persecution, they durst not assemble in great multitudes, the Bishops divided their charges into lesser Parishes, and gave assignments to the Presbyters of particular Flocks, which was done first in *Rome* in the beginning of the second Century, &c.

"And P. 310. I do not alledge a Bishop to be a distinct office from a Presbyter, but a different degree of the same office, &c. P. 331. I acknowledge Bishop and Presbyter to be one and the same office, and so plead for no new Office-bearer in the Church, the first branch of their power, is their authority to publish the Gospel, to manage the worship and dispense the Sacraments, and this is all that is of Divine Right in the Ministry, in which Bishops and Presbyters are equally sharers, but besides this the Church claimeth a power of jurisdiction, of making Rules for Discipline, and applying and executing the same; all which indeed is suitable to the common Laws of Societies and the General Rules of Scripture, but hath no positive warrant from any Scripture Precept — Therefore as to the management of this Jurisdiction, it is in the Churches power to cast it into what mould she will, &c.

I believe I shall rather be censured for having said too much, than not enough upon this Subject, yet I will venture so much farther upon the Readers Patience, (who cannot be wearier of reading than I am, of transcribing) as to conclude this Chapter with the suffrages, of three Famous Divines of the *Gallican* Churches that have all writ in our Day.

*Thes. Sidas. de  
Grad. & di-  
stinct. Minist.*  
p. 501.

Let the learned *le Blanc*, be first heard, thus, "*Quod spectat vero Delictum Presbyteri & Episcopi*, &c. But as to the difference betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, for as much as the Church of *England* is Governed by Bishops, it is the more general opinion of the English, that Episcopacy and Presbytery are distinct offices, instituted by Christ with distinct powers; but the rest of the Reformed, as also they of the *Augustane* Confession, do unanimously believe that there is no such distinction by Divine Right, but that as the names in Scripture are synonymous, and put for each other indifferently, so the thing is wholly the same; and that the superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, which has now for many Ages obtained in the Church, is onely of Positive and Ecclesiastical Right, and has been introduced thereinto by degrees. That even in the Apostles days, a certain pre-cedency of honour and place, was given unto him who did excell his Col-leagues, either in Age or in the time of his Ordination, so that he was as President or Moderator of the Presbytery, and yet look'd upon as altogether of the same office, and had no power or jurisdiction over his Colleagues, and this Person did always perform those things, which

"which the Presidents or Moderators of our Synods now perform."

"But in the following Age it so fell out, that this Primacy was not confer'd according to the Persons Age or time of entrance, but a custom was introduced, that one of the Presbyters should be chosen by the Votes of the whole Colledge, who should continually preside after the same manner over the Presbytery, and these after a while assumed to themselves the name of Bishops, and by degrees gained more and more Prerogatives, and brought their Colleagues into subjection to them, till at length the matter grew up to that Tyranny, which now obtains in the Church of Rome.

"Moreover though all reformed Divines, (excepting those of the Church of England) condemn that supream power, which among the Papists, Bishops usurp over Presbyters as Tyrannical, and think that by the Law of God there is no distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, yet is there some dispute amongst them, whether it be not expedient by Positive and Ecclesiastick rights to appoint some degrees amongst the Ministers of the Gospel, by which some may be set above others, provided such moderation be observed as that it may not degenerate into Tyranny, the French and Dutch Churches, and not a few in England it self, think it dangerous, and not sufficiently agreeable to the Laws of Christ, to admit any such thing, but the Judgment and Practice of the Churches in Germany and Poland is otherwise, they have certain Bishops which they call Superintendents, that preside in such certain districts, over the rest of the Pastors, with some Authority and Power, but much short of that which the Popish Bishops claim.

+ right

The second I shall mention is Monsieur *Jurien*, who having spoken concerning the Monastick Life, and Oecumenick Councils, as two great Novelties which had very unhappy effects, he adds, "Behold a third of them, 'tis the Original of the Hierarchy, which hath given birth to the Antichristian Tyranny, hereby is understood that subordination of Pastors which hath been seen in the Church for 1000 or 1200 years, in this subordination are seen the lowest Orders in the lowest seats, above these are seen the Priests, above the Priests are the grand Vicars, above the Grand Vicars are the Bishops, above the Bishops are the Archbishops or Metropolitans, above the Arch-bishops are the Primates, above the Primates are the Exarchs, above the Exarchs are the Patriarchs, above all these appears a head which was insensibly framed and placed there, this is that which is called the Pope; All this is a new invention with respect to the Apostles who left in all the Churches Presbyters or Bishops to Preach the Word and Administer the Sacraments: But the Bishop and Presbyter were not distinguished, those which St. *Paul* calls Bishops he calls Presbyters in the same place, this is matter of fact which our Adversaries cannot deny: Then he proceeds to tell us how this distinction was made, and the account thereof,

Pastoral Letters, lit. 14.



thereof, agreeing very much of that of *La Blanc*, I shall not transcribe it.

The last I shall take notice of, is the Renowned Monsieur *Claude*, whose Name will be great in all the Churches, as long as Piety and Learning have any esteem among Men; his words are these,

Historical De-  
fence of the  
Reform.  
Part. 4. p. 95. "As for those who are ordained by meer Presbyters, can the Author of  
"the Prejudices be ignorant, that the distinction of Bishop and Priest as if  
"they were two different offices, is not only a thing they cannot prove out  
"of Scripture, but that which even contradicts the express words of Scrip-  
"ture, where Bishop and Presbyter, are names of one and the same office,

+ Right —  
"from whence it follows that Presbyters having by their first Institution a  
"a Rite to confer Ordination, that Rite cannot be taken away from them by  
"meer humane Rules; can the author of the Prejudices be ignorant, that  
"St. *Jerome*, *Hilary*, and after them *Hincmar*, wrote formerly concerning  
"the Unity, or, as they speak, the Identity, of a Priest and Bishop in the  
"beginning of the Church, and about the first rise of that distinction which  
"was afterwards made of them into different offices, can he be ignorant  
"that St. *Austin* himself writing to *Jerome* refers that distinction not to the  
"first institution of the Ministry, but merely to an Ecclesiastical use? And  
"elsewhere, "And to speak my thoughts freely, it seems to me, that this  
"confident opinion, of the absolute necessity of Episcopacy, that goes so  
"high as to own no Church, or Call, or Ministry, or Sacraments, or Sal-  
"vation in the World, where there are no Episcopal Ordinations, although  
"there should be the true Doctrine, the true Faith and Piety there, and  
"which would make all Religion depend upon a formality, and on such a  
"formality as we have shewn to be of no other than Humane Institution,  
"that opinion I say, cannot be lookt on otherwise than as the very worst  
"character, and mark of the highest hypocrisie, a piece of Pharisaisme all over,  
"that strains at a Goat when it swallows a Camel, and I cannot avoid hav-  
"ing at least a contempt of those kind of thoughts, and a compassion for  
"those who fill their Heads with them.

P. 97.

CHAP.



## CHAP. III.

*An inference concerning Ordination, The Point of Succession more largely debated: Our English Bishops have no Jurisdiction, nor their Canons any power, but what is derived from the Civil Magistrates; who has now left us to our Liberty in the case of Conformity, reflections upon Mr. Norris his charge of Schisme continued.*

I Will now venture to leave this point as sufficiently proved, that Bishops have no Power or Jurisdiction given them by the Law of God, but what Presbyters have as well as they, I have been the larger upon it, because it got a great way in deciding the whole controversy, and would save me all further Labour, about the cases of Ordination and Succession.

As to Ordination; if Presbyters be the same with Scripture Bishops, the Orders conferred by them must needs be valid, for as Monsieur Claude says, 'tis a right that cannot be taken away from them by Humane Rules; it is true indeed there may be such a prudent Order agreed upon, for the due management of this work, as may make it irregular to ordain without a President; but such agreements cannot make the action null; for my part I never knew any Ordination amongst Dissenters, but there was a Moderator chosen, who was chiefly concerned in the conduct of it, and such a Moderator wants nothing of the Primitive Bishop: And if there be some Ancient Canons, that say the Presbyters shall not ordain without the Bishop, so there are others that say the Bishop shall not ordain without the Presbyters, and by requiring Presbyters to join in this office, it is certain they have the power, otherwise their laying on of hands would be a meer nullity. The truth is, neither a single Bishop, nor a single Presbyter can regularly Ordain, it ought to be done by a Classis, and in that case there must be some President to avoid confusion, and that is the general practice amongst us, and therefore our Ordinations are not only valid, but regular too.

Bishop Carleton in his Treatise of Jurisdiction, saith, "The Power of Order by all Writers that ever I could see, even of the Church of Rome, is understood to be immediately from Christ, given to all Bishops and Priests alike by their Consecration; And it is very considerable, what Dr. Bernard mentions, concerning Arch-bishop Usher's Opinion in this case, wherein we have this Historical passage, "That in 1609, when the Scotch Bishops were to be consecrated by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Barb, a question was moved by Dr. Andrews Bishop of Ely, whether they must not first be ordained Presbyters, as having received no ordination from a

"Bishop,

Concil Carth.  
3, 4. C. 22.

P. 7.

The Judgment of the late A. R. of Armagh, p. 134, 135.

"Bishop, the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* Dr. *Bancroft*, who was present, maintained, That there was no necessity for it, seeing where Bishops could not be had, Ordination by Presbyters must be esteemed lawful. otherwise it might be doubted whether there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches: this was applauded by the other Bishops, and *Ely* acquiesced in it, &c.

It was too great a hardship therefore that our Bishops put upon the poor banished Ministers of the French Churches, in requiring them to be re-ordained, which in the sense of the imposers, was a renouncing the validity of their former Ordination, and it is very remarkable that some of those that were most zealous in that severe usage of those poor Refugees, and would admit none to be Ministers that did not submit to them in it, are since divested of their Episcopal power themselves, and have now time to consider, whether to allow the Ordinations of the Roman Churches, and reject those of the Reformed, was not (to use Monsieur *Claudes* words) a piece of Pharisisme all over, that strains at a Gnat and swallows a Camel.

And for the pretended Succession, if our Presbyters which have Ministerial Ordination (and I know no other) be really Bishops by the Laws and Language of Scripture, We are in the Line still (as the Vindicator speaks) if such a Line there be: though we look upon it as a most wretched piece of confidence and madness, to make the Essence of the Ministry and Church depend upon a thing so lubricous and uncertain.

But that we may if it be possible lead this Man out of his foolish conceit, about the necessity of an un-interrupted Line of Succession from the Apostles, let us but state the case according to his own assertions, and perhaps when it is rightly put it will not require much arguing; His opinion in this matter, take in these three points.

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 2, 3.

1. He affirms that the Bishops receive their Spiritual Jurisdiction from the Apostles, by the Line of Succession, this Succession he makes the foundation of their Title and Power.

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 3.

2. From hence he infers, that he is no true Bishop, who is not ordained by another Bishop, and so upwards in a continued line of Episcopal Ordination to the Apostles themselves; so that if a Man could shew a Spiritual Pedigree in a Line of Episcopacy for a thousand years, yet if so long ago there was failure, he is but a Lay Impostor. And

Reply, p. 18.

3. That those Churches (or what you'll please to call them) that are not under the Government of such Bishops, as are possess'd of their Authority, by such a Line, are out of the Communion of the Catholick Church, have no Ministry, no Sacraments, no Salvation.

P. 20.

The first of these, that Bishops have their power from the Apostles as being their Successors, will certainly infer, that they could never be possessed of it till the Apostles were dead, unless we can suppose that they were degraded, or voluntarily resigned; this the Vindicator has deservedly exposed, "To be the Apostles Successors in Apostolical power, the Apostles still living

"ing and in Plenitude of Power, is a very great Mystery, and something like the honest Vicar of N's Prayer for King Charles the II. that he might outlive all his Successors; What has the Gentleman to reply to this? He puts on a marvellous grave aspect, and charges the Vindicator with Scoffing at *Timothy* and *Titus*; but this is a poor shift of his own, when he has rendered himself ridiculous, to turn it off to *Timothy* and *Titus*, I do not believe there is any such Affinity or Line of Succession betwixt those blessed Evangelists and this Gentleman, but a man may venture to expose the folly of the latter, and still preserve a due Veneration for the former.

He confesses it was a piece of Ignorance to pray that the King might outlive all his Successors, and why then is not he as ignorant in saying that *Timothy*, and *Titus*, and *Linus*, were made the Successors of the Apostles in their Apostolical Power, whilst the Apostles were still living, for in this case, the Apostles might have outlived their Successors, and if we believe some Historians they did so; and if this be ignorance in the Vicar, it can be no extraordinary piece of Wisdom and Illumination in the Citizen; he confesses this is a mystery, and so he says is all the Gospel, but he must not take upon him to obtrude such stuff of his own upon the World, because the Gospel is a mystery, thanks be to God, a man may easily discern, betwixt the mysteries of the Gospel, and those of *T. W.*'s making.

But if this Notion won't pass under the pretence of Mystery, he will invent a reason for it, which we have in these Words, "They could not have been said to be Successors of Apostolical Power, if the Apostles whilst living had not conferr'd it upon them, could the Apostles have ordained then after they were dead? No truly, no more than give Scripture Rules after they were dead; but were all that the Apostles ordained their Successors in Apostolical Power, then the Presbyters which they ordained must be so too; He says, *The Apostle by ordaining them in his Life-time, secured the Succession to them, and the Government too in the Apostles absence*: But I wish he had told us how they could secure the Succession to them, unless they could have secured them from dying before them; and for securing the Government to them in the Apostles absence, that was no more than what they did for the Presbyters, but if they were invested in Apostolical Power, they had enjoyed the Government as much in the Apostles Presence, as in their Absence, for the Apostles had all the same Power, and had it alike whether together or asunder; In short, if it be really true, that the Bishops must either be the Apostles Successors in Apostolical Power, whilst the Apostles lived, or they could never be so, we must conclude, they could never be so, for whilst the Apostles lived, they could not have Successors in their Office, especially such as claimed their Power by such Succession.

The second Point is equally censurable, *viz.* That he is no true Bishop, that was not ordained by another Bishop, and so upwards to the Apostles; This the Vindicator told him was altogether unproved, and that the Papists, whose Interest it is to make men believe so, confess there are insupe-

table difficulties about the Succession of Popes in the Roman See : The Gentleman replies, " I never discoursed with any of that Church, who did not zealously affirm the Succession, that all established Catholick Churches do assert it, and that in every Diocesi, it is as sacredly recorded, as the Succession of Kings and Emperors to their Thrones, and challenges his Adversary to prove the contrary. Well I'll be so civil to him as to tell him, that, which it seems he knew not before, touching the uncertainty of this Line of Succession.

*Eusebius* himself, notwithstanding the Conjectures that he makes concerning the Successors of the Apostles, after all ingenuously confesses, *Ὅτι δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῶν γνήσιων Συναγῶν γενησὶν ἡ ἐκδοὺς ἐστίν*, &c. But how many or who were the true Successors of the Apostles, and thought sufficient to govern the Churches founded by them, is hard to say, excepting those which perhaps some one may gather, out of the writings of St. *Paul* upon which a Learned Prelate says, " What becomes then of our unquestionable Line of Succession of the Bishops of several Churches, and the large Diagramms made of the Apostolical Churches, with every ones Name set down in his Order, " as if the Writer had been *Clarencieux* to the Apostles themselves? Is it come to this at last, that we have nothing certain but what we have in the Scriptures? Are all the outcries of Apostolical Tradition, of Personal Succession, of Unquestionable Records, resolved at last into Scripture it self, by him, from whom all these Pedigrees are fetched? Then let Succession know its place, and vail Bonnet to the Scriptures, and withal let men take heed of over-reaching themselves when they would bring down so large a Catalogue of single Bishops from the first and purest times of the Church, for it will be hard for others to believe them, when *Eusebius* professeth it is so hard to find them.

There are two things to be done, before a man can prove this uninterrupted Line; first, He must have a true Catalogue of the Names of all such Bishops as have filled the See, and then he must be able to demonstrate that none of them, came in after a Surreptitious manner without Episcopal Ordination; the former is difficult, but the latter much harder, and yet without it, the former will amount to no more than a Wild-goose row of hard Words and Names.

1. It is extremely Difficult to get a satisfactory Catalogue, even in that See whose Bishops have made the greatest noise and figure in the World, and if this Gentleman has any Friend that will consult *Baronius* for him, I suppose he will forbear making challenges for the future.

*Licet plerique sine vitio Scriptoris acciderit sine alia ex causa*, &c. the learned Annalist shews, that *Optatus Milevitanus* rehearsing the Catalogue of Roman Bishops down to his own times, begins thus. In the principal Chair sate, first *Peter*, then *Linus* succeeded, to him *Clement*, to him *Anacletus*, ( passing by *Cletus* as thinking him the same with *Anacletus* ) but on the other hand *Epiphanius*, omitting *Anacletus*, mentions *Cletus*, speaking



ing thus, The Succession of the Bishops of Rome is in this Order, Peter and Paul, Linus, Cletus, Clemens, Evaristus; St. Austin following Optatus omits Cletus, thinking him the same with Anacletus; St. Jerom speaking of Clemens says, he was the fourth Bishop of Rome from Peter, that Linus was the Second and Cletus the Third, although many of the Latines think that Clemens was the second; of these jarring accounts, Baronius says, *Si in Nom. 48. ordine & tempore primarum Romanorum Pontificum quempiam errare contigerit, in multos errores ferri omnino cogetur.*

The Author of the Roman Ceremonial, endeavours to reconcile these things by a fine Conjecture, "*Ipse Jesus primum denominatione Successorem* Lib. 1. cap. 2. "*constituit & caratione, &c.* Jesus Christ appointed his Successor by Name, "and after the same manner Peter also named Clemens, but on this Condition, that the Senate of the Roman Church would admit of him, but they "knowing that this way of naming ones Successor, would in time be very "Prejudicial to the Church, would not accept of Clemens, but chose Linus to "hold the Pontificate after Peter, but that afterward, when both Linus and "Cletus were dead Clemens was chosen by the Senate it self.

Of these Primitive times the great Scaliger thus speaks, "*Intervallum il-* Prolog. in Eu- "*lud ab ultimo, &c.* That interval of time from the last Chapter of the sed. Chron. "*Acts of the Apostles, to the Middle of the Reign of Trajan, in which* "*Quadratus and Ignatius flourished, might be called also an obscure con-* "*fused time, in which nothing is delivered to us certainly concerning the* "*Affairs of the Christians, besides a few things that the Enemies of the Church* "*touch upon by the way, as Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny, &c.* Now to fill "*up this Chasm, Eusebius has carelessly fetch'd things out of his own store out* "*of the Hypotyposes of which I know not what Clement (for it is not, Alexan-* "*drinus sequatur) and out of the Commentaries of Hieronymus, a writer of* "*no better Credit than the former.*

These Perplexities the Learned Bishop of Worcester thus relates, "*Come* Irmo. p. 322 "*we therefore to Rome and here the Succession is as muddy as the Tyber it* "*self, for Tertullian, Rufinus and others, place Clemens next to Peter, Ire-* "*naeus and Eusebius set Anacletus before him, Epiphanius and Optatus both* "*Anacletus and Cletus, Augustine and Damasus, make Anacletus, Cletus* "*and Linus all to precede him; certainly if the Line of Succession fails us* "*here, where we most need it we have little cause to pin our Faith upon* "*it, as to the certainty of any particular form of Church Government,* "*which can be drawn from the help of the records of the Primitive Church.*

And we do not only meet with these Difficulties, near the Head of the Line, but many Ages lower; The Series of Popes in the Roman See, after the eighth Century, is very much ruffled and confused, as Onuphrius tells us, "*Horum temporum Pontifices, neq; perpetuum quendam habent Scripto-* Praefat. ad "*rem, &c.* The Bishops of those times have not any constant certain Wri- partem secund. "*ter, and a great part of their Affairs are omitted, whence it comes to pass, de Roman "*that these times are so uncertain and obscure, that we cannot tell in what Pontif.



"Order the Names of divers Popes ought to be put, and some new Popes have crept in, which by Computation of the time can have no place in the Roll, as *Basilius*, one *Agapetus*, and *Domnus* the second, which are either the same with others under a different name, or else were Schismatics or perhaps were never in being, but which of these to affirm is uncertain and doubtful; and he tells us, that as to *John* the 11th, *Leo* the 6th, *Stephen* the 8th, *Leo* the 7th, and *Stephen* the 9th. He has not followed the common Opinion of Writers, but of *Luitprandus Ticinensis*, and says there is a foul mistake in the account of the *Martins*, for there never were any such men as *Martin* the 2d and 3d. and in the *Johns*; *quanta, bone Deus, confusio exorta est ex veterum Historiarum ignorantia!*

It seems our Learned Citizen, never dreamed that Popish Writers should be so ingenuous as to confess these insuperable difficulties in the Succession, for his part he never discours'd with any of them that did not zealously assert it, and it may be so, but certainly then he never discoursed with the wisest or honestest of them, but had the good hap always to meet with men as bold and ignorant as himself. But

2. Were these Catalogues of Names, as clear and certain as they are otherwise, yet unless it were equally certain that all of these were truly Bishops, and had valid Consecration, the Line of Succession is still unproved; and how impossible is it to have this demonstrated with that clearness, requisite unto a point upon which the Truth of our Churches and Salvation of our Souls is made to depend.

For it has been often observed, that our Church Historians being left so much in the dark for the earliest Ages, are forced to supply the defects of History with bold conjectures of their own; and where-ever they met with the Apostles or Evangelists in any place, presently they made them the Bishops of that place, so *Philip* is made Bishop of *Trallis*, *Ananias* Bishop of *Damascus*, *Nicolaus* Bishop of *Samaria*, *Barnabas* Bishop of *Millan*, *Silas* Bishop of *Corinth*, *Sylvanus* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, *Crescens* of *Chalcedon*, *Andreas* of *Byzantium*, and upon the same grounds *Peter* Bishop of *Rome*.

And through the loss of the Dyptychs of the Church, which would have acquainted us with the time of the Primitive Martyrs Suffering, called their *Natalitia*, some have mistaken Martyrs for Bishops, and the time of their Apotheosis, for that of their Consecration, and the Learned *Junius* reckons among these *Anactus*, *Cletus* and *Clemens* at *Rome*.

And how shall we prove that all the persons mentioned in the Lists, had such Ordination as is made essential to Episcopacy; it is not sufficient to say there were ancient Canons, decreeing that no Bishop should be Consecrated but by three at the least, this is arguing a *jure ad factum*, which is no better than to argue a *facto ad jus*, it is certain there were abundance of excellent Canons made, and it is as certain they were very little regarded, in that state of Apostasy and Antichristianism into which the Churches fell, and lay for so long a time; we know there are many examples of mens getting into the

the highest Church Preferments by Murther, Simony, Sorcery, which by the Ancient Canons nullifie their Authority and Administrations; It is certain there are many excellent Precepts in Scripture against judging, hating and persecuting one another about Ceremonies, but if any shall argue from hence there were never any such Practices, every age will afford instances enough for their Confutation; and if there has been so notorious a contempt of the Laws of Christ; Why should we think it strange, if the Canons of the Church have been despised too, when they have stood in the way of mens Interest? Every body knows Ecclesiastical Canons are meer Spiders Webs only to catch Flies, whilst the greater sort of Vermine rush through.

The Council of Lateran decreed, *Electio facta per civilem Magistratum in sacris beneficiis vim nullam habeat*; and the *Jus Orientale*, and the seventh Lib. 3. Inter. General Council (as it is called) determine, *Omnem Electionem qua fit a* 59.

*Magistratibus, Episcopi vel Presbyteri vel Diaconi irritam esse*; and yet that *de facto* the Magistrates sometimes did elect will not be denied. The second Council of Nice decreed that the Orders of all Symoniacal Bishops shall be null and void, *ἀλλήτερος τῆς ἀξίας ἢ τῷ γεννηματι* *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* *ἡρώων*, Bernard con. Conc. Carth. 4.

And yet *Eugenius* and others were notoriously guilty of it; and therefore the late Examiner of the Notes of the Church says, "It is probable the

"Roman Church wants a Head, and that there is now no true Pope, nor

"has been for many Ages for that Church to be united to, for by their own

"Confession a Pope Symoniacally chosen, a Pope intruded by Violence, a

"Heretick and therefore sure an Atheist, or an Infidel is no true Pope, and

"many such there have been of one sort or other, whose acts therefore in

"creating Cardinals, &c. Being invalid, it is exceeding probable that the

"whole Succession has upon this account failed long ago, &c.

I may add hereunto, that it is the opinion of Dr. *Heylin*, where there is

no Dean and Chapter to elect and no Arch-Bishop to Consecrate, there can

be no regular Succession of Bishops; now where there are so many junctures

in which this Line may fail, it would be very strange if in all that Series of

Ordainers and Ordinations, none of those things should happen which break

in upon the Succession.

Nay farther, when a Bishop has advanced by lawful paces to the Chair,

yet it is not impossible, but he may lose this power again; I know the Pa-

pists have invented the *Chimara* of an indelible Character to support the

other *Chimara* of an uninterrupted Succession: But Bishop *Jewel* affirms,

"That if the Bishop of *Rome* (and I suppose it will hold of any other) do

"not his Duty as he ought, except he Administer the Sacraments, except he

"instruct the People, except he warn them and teach them, he ought not

"to be called a Bishop, or so much as an Elder; for a Bishop, as saith St. *Au-*

*gustin*, is a name of Labour, and not of Honour; and that man that seeketh

"to have the Pre-eminence, and not to profit the People, must know he is

"no Bishop: And he vindicates this Saying against *Harding* from other of

the Fathers, *Chrysostom* Hom. 13. *Multis Sacerdotes & pauci Sacerdotes, multi*

*nomine*

Lib. 3. Inter.

Magistratibus, Episcopi vel Presbyteri vel Diaconi irritam esse; and yet that

de facto the Magistrates sometimes did elect will not be denied. The second

Council of Nice decreed that the Orders of all Symoniacal Bishops shall

be null and void, ἀλλήτερος τῆς ἀξίας ἢ τῷ γεννηματι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡρώων, Bernard con.

Conc. Carth. 4.

And yet Eugenius and others were notoriously guilty of it; and there-

fore the late Examiner of the Notes of the Church says, "It is probable the

Notes of the

"Roman Church wants a Head, and that there is now no true Pope, nor

Church, p.

"has been for many Ages for that Church to be united to, for by their own

"Confession a Pope Symoniacally chosen, a Pope intruded by Violence, a

"Heretick and therefore sure an Atheist, or an Infidel is no true Pope, and

"many such there have been of one sort or other, whose acts therefore in

"creating Cardinals, &c. Being invalid, it is exceeding probable that the

"whole Succession has upon this account failed long ago, &c.

This, &c. Is to be supplied with

Arch-Bishops

Bishops and

all other Or-

ders.

Advertisement

on the Hist. of

K. Charles, p.

193.

Apology, c. 3.

divis. 7.

Defence of Apol.

Part 2. p. 135.

*nomine & pauci opere*; And St. *Ambrose*, *Nisi bonum opus amplectaris, Episcopus esse non potes, de dignit. Sacerdot. c. 4.* And *Gregory* speaking in the name of wicked Prelates, *Sacerdotes nominamur, non sumus*; And the Council of *Valentia* under *Damasus*, *Quicumq; sub ordinatione vel Diaconatus vel Presbyterii vel Episcopatus mortali crimine dixerint se esse pollutos à supra dictis ordinationibus submoveantur*; Whosoever he be, whether of the Order of Deacon, Presbyter or Bishop, that is convicted of deadly Sin, let him be removed from the said Orders. Now can any man imagine that in a Line of above 1600 Years length, running through *Babylon* it self, there should be none of these, who by their intolerable wickedness had nullified their Title? We unto Mankind, if their Salvation depend upon such a Supposition.

Thirdly, The third Part of this Gentleman's Position is, That those Churches, or (if they must not be so called) those Societies that are not under the Government of such Bishops, are out of the Communion of the Catholick Church, have no Ministry, nor Sacraments, nor Salvation.

This cuts off at a blow the Church of *Alexandria*, and damns all her Members for the First two Hundred Years: Of the Government of that Church, we have this remarkable Account from *Eutychius* Patriarch there.

*Eutychii An-  
nal. Ptochis  
Edit. P. 328.*

That the Evangelist *Mark* in the Ninth year of *Claudius Caesar*, came unto the City of *Alexandria*, and called the People to the Faith of Christ, and as he was walking in the Street broke the Latchet of his Shoe, and presently applied himself to one *Ananias*, a Cobler, to get it mended; in the doing of it, *Ananias* prick'd his Finger with the Aul, after that dangerous manner, as caused a great effusion of Blood and much Pain, insomuch, as that he murmured against *Mark*; who said unto him, If thou wilt believe on Jesus Christ thy Finger shall be healed, and added, In his Name let it be made whole; and accordingly in the same moment it ceased bleeding and was well; from this time *Ananias* believed, and was baptized by *Mark*, and made Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and with him were appointed twelve Presbyters, that when the Patriarchate was vacant, one of them should be chosen, on whom the other Eleven should lay their hands, and bless him and create him Patriarch, and then should choose some worthy Person and constitute him a Presbyter in his room who was made Patriarch: And this Custom continued till *Alexander* the Sixteenth Patriarch without interruption, which was about 235 Years. This Story St. *Jerome* likewise tells us, and by it proves the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters, and that Presbyters have not only Power to ordain those of the same degree with themselves, but to consecrate Patriarchs too.

*Hierom Ep. ad  
Evag. 85.*

And this Assertion undoes all the Reformed Churches abroad that are governed by Presbyters; To this the Gentleman replies, That many very Learned and Pious Persons amongst them, have declared their longing Desires for the Episcopacy, but living in Popish Dominions, cannot have any but those of the Popish Communion, or in Republicks that will not admit of Episcopacy.

But

But are desires then of Episcopacy sufficient to bring a Man within Catholick Communion? What then becomes of the Absolute necessity of Apostolical Succession, if affectionate Desires after this Communion will free a Man from Schism? Then surely Schism lies in the want of such Desires, which comes nearer to Mr. H's Notion than this Gentleman I suppose was aware of; but after all (though 'tis pity to put him out of a good humour, since he happens so seldom into it) if there be no Catholick Communion without Episcopacy, and without such Communion, our hopes for Salvation are but Fancies, as this Gentleman tells us; Desires after Episcopacy will not relieve Men, it will only prove that they desire such Communion, and to be in the way of Salvation, but that at present they are not so.

And I wonder how it does appear that the Reformed Churches desire this Diocesan Episcopacy; by what Publick Acts do they declare any such Desires? What their Thoughts are concerning it we have already seen: It may be indeed (as the Honourable Mr. *Fines* once replied in Parliament to this very thing) there are some amongst them that desire Episcopacy, that is, the Dignities and Revenues of Bishops, but that any desire Episcopacy as the fittest and best Government of the Church, I do not believe; for if they would have Bishops, I know not what hindreth but they may; they have Presbyteries, and Synods, and National Assemblies, and Moderators therein, and how easily might these be made Bishops? *Germany* and *Poland* are Popish Countries, and yet they have Superintendents or Bishops; And why will not Republicks admit Episcopacy? Is it because they have found it injurious to the Commonwealth? Methinks that is no great Commendation of the Order, or will they say it does not so well comport with that Form of Government? That is a sign it is not of Divine Institution; for, as God will have Gospel-Churches in all Countries, so he has put nothing into their Constitution, but what will consist with any form of Civil Polity, and has not obliged Republican States to become Monarchies, in order to their reception of the Gospel. I know nothing the Church has to do with Civil Constitutions, nor will I ever be of that Ecclesiastical Communion which cannot subsist in Commonwealths as well as in Monarchies, but must overturn Publick Constitutions to make room for its own Settlement.

And as this Doctrine overturns the Primitive, and the Reformed Churches; so this Gentleman knows not how great a shock he has given his own by it: For Historians tell us, that those Famous Bishops who were instrumental in Converting so many in the Northern Parts of our Island to Christianity, were ordained by the Abbot of *Hye*, who was only a Presbyter; and who knows how far the Line of those Bishops reaches. To this, the Gentleman has made some reply, telling us, That Archbishop *Bramhall* has cleared the *Northumbrian* Bishops from receiving their Consecration of the Abbot of *Hye*; and shews that they had it from the Bishop of *Derry*, under whose Visitation this Abbot lived, and that this was to be found in the Records at *Derry* before the Irish Rebellion.

But



*Beda Eccl.  
Hist. l. 3. c. 4.  
Habersfolit  
ip[s]a Insula  
rectorem sem-  
per Abbatum  
Presbyterum,  
&c.*

*Usher de Ec-  
cles. Brit.  
Primordiis.  
p. 701.*

But it is a strange piece of Confidence in these Men to set up a Story reported by themselves out of I know not what invisible Records, so to confront the direct words of our most ancient and credible Historians. *Beda* expressly says that *Island* was wont to have an Abbot for its Governour, who was always a Presbyter, to whose Jurisdiction all the Province, and even the Bishops themselves, were subject after the example of their first Teacher *Columbanus*, who was not a Bishop, but a Presbyter and Monk; and that King *Oswald* when he came to the Throne, sent to the Elders of *Scotland* amongst whom in his Exile he had been baptized, to desire that a Bishop might be sent unto him, by whose Doctrine and Ministry his Realm might learn and receive the Christian Faith; From this Island of *Hye*, and from the College of Monks there, *Aidan* was sent, having received the Degree of Episcopacy, at that time when *Segenius* a Presbyter was the Abbot, and that *Aidan* being dead, *Finan* succeeded him, being likewise sent by the same Monastery:

The Gentleman tells us we have the story in the Bishop of *St. Asaph* to the same purpose with *Brambal*, but he does not tell us that Sir *George Mackenzie* has answered him; besides it is not the same story, for *St. Asaph* will have it to be the Bishop of *Dunkeld* that joyned in this Consecration not *Derry* or *Derry-magh*; if there was any such story in those Records 'tis a wonder these Gentlemen should not agree better in the telling of it.

*Vindic. of  
some Protest.  
Princ. p. 102.*

The ingenious Dr. *Sherlock*, wisely declines disputing the matter of fact concerning this Abbots Ordination of Bishops, and fairly grants that the Church of *Rome* allows the Ordinations of Abbots Sovereign, which are but Presbyters, to be both valid and regular, but says such Ordinations were an encroachment upon the Episcopal Authority, and void in themselves, which I shall not now question, it being sufficient and indeed only proper to my present purpose to shew that Abbots did Ordain, and were allowed to do it by the Church of *Rome*, and if such orders be void then the Episcopal Line is broken.

And who can forbear declaiming against the wretched folly of Men of such principles, that will thus unsettle the foundations of their own Churches, that they may overturn others, and like the Executioners of the three Children will venture a burning themselves, that they may be sure to throw others far enough into the fiery Furnace.

Let us hear how this Gentleman will demonstrate this uninterrupted Line of Succession, for He ought to make it as clear as any Article of his Creed, there being none more essential to Salvation according to his own account of it. And he tells us, "The very necessity of such a Line is a sufficient reason to prove it, no man can be Minister of the Gospel that is not sent, no man has power to send, who hath not received it by Succession from the Apostles; That is to say, it is so, because it must be so; and it must be so, because it is absolutely necessary it should be so; and if this be not proof sufficient, we must go to those that can give us better. But,

1st. Why



1st. Why does he not prove that there can be no true mission without such a Line? we cannot give him credit in a matter of such value, and though he repeat it a thousand times, we will not regard it, till we see it proved; We do verily believe with the rest of the Reformed Churches, that where-ever the *Cætus Fidelium* is, there lies an inherent fundamental right of chusing, and calling persons to the Ministry, though this is most regularly exercised by those that are already Pastors, and ought not to be done by others where such may conveniently be had; but all the World besides the Papists and a few odd Bigotted persons in our own Nation, distinguish betwixt an irregularity and a nullity, and we believe that both Sacred and Civil Societies agree in this, which is founded upon the essence, and common principles of all Societies as such, that they have a latent power to elect and invest their Officers, though by Custom, or the Laws of the Community, the exercise thereof may be consigned to a particular Order of Men amongst them.

The Author of the *Prejudices* challenges Monsieur *Claude* to produce any Texts of Scripture, that give Lay-Men a right to ordain Ministers in any case; to which he replies, "This demand is but a vain wrangling, for when Scripture recommends to the Faithful, the taking diligent heed to the preservation and confirmation of their Faith, and to propagate it to their Children, it gives them by that very thing a sufficient right to make use of all proper means in order to that end; and every body knows the Ministry is one of those means, and therefore the obligation the faithful are under to preserve and propagate the Faith, includes that of *Creating* to themselves Pastors when they cannot have them otherwise; in short when the Scripture teaches that the faithful have a right to chuse their Pastors, it teaches thereby that they have a right to instal them into their Office in case of necessity, for that call consisting much more essentially in Election than in installation, which is but a formality, there is no reason to believe that God would have given the People a Right to chuse their Pastors, and to have them installed by others, and that he has not given them at the same time a power of installing them themselves, when it cannot be done otherwise, since naturally that which we have a right to do by another, we have a right to do by our selves.

Nay, what if not onely Monsieur *Claude*, but Monsieur *Dodwell* too, that speaking head of our high-flown Clergy, acknowledges such a right in particular Societies of chusing and investing their Officers? No matter whether it be reconcileable with the other parts of his Scheme or no: In his Separation of Churches he speaks to this purpose. "The Church with whom God has made the Covenant, is a Body Politick, though not a Civil one, and God has designed all persons to enter into this Society; — It is sufficient for my purpose that the Ecclesiastical Power be no otherwise from God, than that is of every supream Civil Magistrate; it is not usual for Kings to be invested into their Offices by other Kings, but by their Subjects, yet when they are invested that doth not in the least prejudice the absoluteness of their

Defence of  
the Reform.  
P. IV. p. 94.  
95

*Dodwell* Separat. of Churches p. 102.  
P. 52.

" Monarchy, where the Fundamental Constitutions of the respective places  
 " allow it to them, much less doth it give any power over them to the per-  
 " sons by whom they are invested; If the power of Episcopacy be Divine,  
 " all that men can do in the case, is onely to determine the person, not to  
 " confine his power — no act can be presumed to be the act of the whole  
 P. 509. " Body, but what has passed them in their publick Assemblies ( in which  
 " Body is the Right of Government. ) — As nothing but the Society it  
 " self can make a valid conveyance of its right, so it is not conceivable, how  
 " the Society can do it by any thing but its own Act — And when  
 P. 522. " ever a person is invested into the Supream Power, and the Society over  
 " which he is placed, is independant on other Societies, such a person can  
 " never be placed in his power, if not by them who must after be his subjects,  
 " unless by his Predecessor, which no Society can depend upon for a con-  
 " stant Rule of Succession. — I am apt to think this must have been the way  
 " of making Bishops at first, how absolute soever I conceive them to be when  
 P. 523. " they are once made — This seems best to agree with the absoluteness  
 " of particular Churches, before they had by compact united themselves under  
 " Metropolitans and Exarchs, into Provincial, and Diocesan Churches;  
 " And this seems to have been fitted for the frequent persecutions of those  
 " earlier Ages, when every Church was able to secure its own succession,  
 " without depending on the uncertain opportunities of the meeting of the  
 " Bishops of the whole Province; And the alteration of this practice, the  
 " giving the Bishops of the Province an interest in the choice of every par-  
 " ticular Colleague, seems not to have been so much for want of power in  
 " the particular Churches to do it, as for the security of compacts that they  
 " might be certain of such a Colleague as would observe them — It is pro-  
 " bable that it was in imitation of the Philosophers Successions, that  
 " these Ecclesiastical Successions were framed, and when the Philosophers  
 " failed to nominate their own Successors, the Election was in the Schools.  
 " These are his words, and they are too plain to need a Comment: If every par-  
 " ticular Church had Originally a power within it self to chuse and invest its  
 " Bishop, and the concurrence of other Bishops herein was not for want of  
 " Power in that particular Church, but only for securing the agreement of  
 " Bishops amongst themselves, We have done with the necessity of a conti-  
 " nued Line of Episcopal Ordinations, and there may be true mission without  
 " it, *quod erat probandum.* But,

2dly, Should we grant that there is a necessity of an uninterrupted Line,  
 and that this, as he learnedly speaks, is a sufficient proof that there is such a  
 Line, yet it must be considered, this necessity will onely prove that there  
 must be some Bishops and Churches that are in the Line, but it will not  
 prove that they are all so, nor that it is the case of those amongst us; for  
 though we may suppose that God has had a true Ministry in all Ages, and  
 will have, that will not demonstrate that he hath such in *England*, and there-  
 fore to prove the Ministry of the English Churches true, he must have some  
 better

better Evidence than the necessity of such a Line which will onely prove it is somewhere, not that it is amongst us; and it is but small satisfaction to us, to know that there is a true Ministry some where in the World, but no man in the World can tell where it is; By this Gentlemans way of reasoning the Papists pretend to prove the Infallibility of their Church, first they suppose the necessity of an Infallible Judge, and then take it for granted that this Judge is to be found amongst them, and truly *Arcades ambo*.

The Vindicator put a question to him, and we should be glad of a better answer than he has yet thought fit to give us; "He desired T. W. to tell him "whether this Line of Succession might be continued in a Schismatical "Church, for if by Schism Men and Societies are cut off from the Catho- "lick Church as this Man affirms, such Schismatical Churches are indeed "no Churches, no parts of the Universal Church, and so cannot be the Sub- "jects of the Apostolical Power; and if this Power cannot be derived through "a Schismatical Church, then must he grant, either that the Church of "England has not this Power; or that the Papal Churches through which "it runs are not Schismatical; and if they be not, his own Church must be "so in separating from them, for he holds separation to be utterly unlawful, unless it be from a Schismatical Church.

His answer to this, such as it is, you have in the 23 page of his reply, in these words. "I cannot understand his Logick in this, if by Schism Men "and Societies are cut off from the Universal Church, then such Schismatical "Churches are no Churches.

But is not the consequence as plain as can be, if Schism cut Men and Societies off from the Universal Church, then such Schismatical Societies are no Churches? Can they be Churches, and yet cut off from the Universal Church? Can they be cut off by Schism, and still united to it? He that does not understand the Logick of this, does not understand the Logick of Common Sense; but has he nothing farther to reply? Yes he says, *Churches they are, though Schismatical, while they retain the Apostolical Succession*. But the Question is, whether Schismatical Churches can retain the Apostolical Succession? Since by Schism he says they are cut off from the Catholick Church, and so Unchurched; these things will require a second reading, and a more direct reply, and that I may provoke him to do it, I shall lay the case before him, in these three points.

1. If any Schismatical Societies may still remain Churches, then Schism as such, does not cut Men and Societies off from the Unity of the Catholick Church, and then the whole thread of his discourse is spoiled, which every where makes Schism to be Separation from the Communion of the Catholick Church, out of which he says truly there is no true Ministry, nor Sacrament.

2. If all Schismatical Societies are Unchurched, then either they lose the Apostolical Succession and Power, or else there may be Apostolical Power where there is no Church; And it would be very strange to find a Power to

Ordain and to Administer Sacraments in Societies, where there can be no Ministry nor Sacraments; Church Power without a Church, a Right to Govern the Church by Apostolical Succession, and yet no Right to the Church or any of its Privileges; The power which is an adjunct, without the Church which is its Subject; These are mysteries which I am no more worthy to understand, than that of Transubstantiation.

3. If the Papal Churches through which this Power is conveyed be not Schismatical, then he makes the Founders of his own Church so, for he says, There's no way of holding Communion with the Universal Church, but by holding Communion with the Particular Churches we live amongst, if they be not Schismatical.

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 6.

Instead of speaking plainly to these things, he asks us whether Re-ordination of those that come over from the Church of *Rome* to the Reformed, was ever required? We answer No, and can give a good reason for it upon our Principles, but it will be hard to do so upon his: We do not think the validity of the Ministry depends upon such Line, nor do we believe that either Schism or Heresie, as such, do utterly destroy their Church state, indeed a renunciation of any of the fundamental Articles of our Faith would do it; but every heresie will not: We believe the Church of *Rome* to be both Schismatical and Heretical, but do not therefore say their Church state is utterly lost, though greatly corrupted, for then it would be hard to allow their Ordinations, especially if we thought Ordination so necessary, and that the Validity thereof depended upon the Administrators, as this Gentleman affirms.

Therefore where he says the Vindicator attempts to unchurch the Church of *England*, because our Bishops derive their consecration from *Rome*, he utterly mistakes himself, the Vindicator spoke *ad hominem*, and only shewed him what would be the consequence of his own arguing.

He tells us *It is the Judgement of all Reformed Divines, that formal Schism can never invalidate the power of formal and regular Ordination.* But if those Reformed Divines thought as he, that formal Schism utterly excludes out of the Catholick Church, they must needs acknowledge that where there is formal Schism, there can be no such things as regular Ordination; and 'tis strange this Gentleman, that makes Schism such an unchurching thing, shall talk of a regular Ordination in a formal Schism; one would think the regularity would have been spoiled, if the Essence thereof should happily escape, (And yet some of our Doctors, make this the very reason why the Dissenters Ordinations are Null, because they ordain in a Schism, granting Prot. Princ. that in case of necessity they may do it.) But as to the Reformed Divines, p. 107, 108. if they allow the Ordination of Schismatics to be valid, it is either because they think the validity of the Orders, does not depend upon the qualifications of the person conferring them, or that Schism does not necessarily exclude a Person or People out of the Communion of the Catholick Church; and here lies this Gentlemans Error, he would tack the candid conclusion of the Reformed

Dr. Siorlock  
Vindic. of  
Prot. Princ.  
p. 107, 108.

formed Churches, to the unmerciful Premises of his own, but they will by no means comport.

This Notion of the Necessity of an uninterrupted Line of Succession for the conveyance of Power, like Water by Pipes and Conduits, the Vindicator made bold to call a Whimsie, which has exceedingly raised the Gentlemen's Spleen; *A Whimsie (says he,) that's some Phantastick device, or the Creature of an unstable unsettled Brain, which being applied to Prelates that bear the Authority of Christ can be no less than Blasphemy.*

But the Vindicator never charged this Whimsie upon the Prelates, the greatest part of whom I dare say will not thank this man for hanging their Authority upon so slender a thread; 'tis his own Whimsie, and so silly a one that we will never charge it on any that do not expressly own it; and yet if a Man should venture to say of some Prelates, that they are unstable and their Brains unsettled (as namely the late Bishops of Oxford and Ely, &c.) I know not how it can be proved Blasphemy, nor will any man call it so that has not made an Idol of the Mitre, or the Head that wears it, unless these clamours proceed from the same Principle with those of the *Ephesians*, who were as tender of their *Diana*, as these men are of the Hierarchy and this Image of Succession that dropt down from *Jupiter*.

After all we have said against the Necessity of such a Line, yet if this Gentleman or any for him will clear it, we will have as much Benefit by it as himself, having largely proved that Presbyters are the same with Bishops by the Law of God, and therefore our Ordinations are as valid as theirs, but we will never so far betray the Honour of the Church, nor the Peace of mens Consciences, as to make all depend upon that which is impossible to be proved; and certainly if it be a thing of that consequence this Gentleman makes it, the proof should be as strong and clear as that of the most essential Doctrines of our Religion; and to say as Mr. *Dodwel* is forced at last that a Presumptive Title may serve, is to unsay all, and to confess that it is not the reality of such a Line on which the Power depends, but the strong Conceit and Presumption of men, which is the worst Basis that Episcopacy has ever yet been fixed upon.

2. The second thing in our Plea, is, That the whole Jurisdiction of our English Bishops, and the Power of their Canons is derived from the Civil Magistrate and Laws of the Land.

And this I think will follow from the former, if this Prelatical Power be not from the Laws of God, it must be from the Laws of the Land. Here I expect some will reply, *Datur tertium*, there is the *Jus Ecclesiasticum*, resulting from the Customs and Canons of the Church, by which Bishops formerly laid claim to this Power, even when there was no Christian Magistrate; but this will be soon answered. For,

1. This *Jus Ecclesiasticum*, has not the proper nature of a Law, nor does it oblige by virtue of strict Authority; we are not bound in Conscience, by the Canons of Ancient Foreign Churches, any farther than the matter of them



*Grot. de Imp-  
sum. Potestas.*  
p. 168.

*Burnets A-  
bridgement, p.*  
139.

*Vind. of Prot.*  
*Princ. p. 30.*  
*Vind. of the*  
*Def. of Dr. St.*  
*p. 162.*

p. 119.

them brings the stamp of Scripture along with it; The Learned *Grotius*, has fully proved, that there never was a Council truly called General, excepting that of the Apostles at *Jerusalem*; that Councils have no governing Power, *Non ideo convocari Synodum quod in eo pars sit imperii*. Yea that the Church has no Legislative Power by Divine Right, That what was written in Synods for Order and Ornament are not called Laws, but Canons, and have either the force of advice only, or they oblige by way of agreement, &c. And our Reforming Bishops, *Cranmer, Tonstal* and others, being required to give their opinions concerning the Authority of General Councils, declared that this Authority did not flow from the number of the Bishops but from the matter of their decisions, and this indeed is the only true notion of Ministerial Power, it depends purely upon the matter of their Canons, not the Authority of the Person, so that they can never by their Authority make a thing indifferent to become a Duty; *Præcians ipsi iudicio directivo*, says *Grotius*, they are Councils, not Parliaments, and only to shew men what is Sin and Duty, not to make any thing Duty, which was not so before. Dr. *Sherlock* fairly acquits himself of the Suspicion of ascribing unto a Council of Bishops, any Power in matter of Faith, or Manners, or Catholick Unity; and because in a former Treatise he had let fall an Expression that might seem to give them such a Power, he by much struggling gets from under it, and says he meant no more than a Power of Deposing Heretical Bishops, but withal adds, "It does not follow that any Bishops, or any Number of Bishops, however assembled, have such an Authority to declare Heresie, as shall oblige all men to believe that to be Heresie which they decree to be so; and therefore the effects of those Censures must of Necessity depend upon that Opinion which People have of them; those who believe the Censure just, will withdraw from the Communion of such a Bishop, those who do not, will still communicate with him; and whether they do right or wrong, their own Consciences must judge in this World, and God will Judge in the next. And elsewhere he thus speaks, "As for Ecclesiastical Causes, nothing is a pure Ecclesiastical Cause, but what concerns the Communion of the Church, who shall be received into Communion, or cast out or put under some less Censures, &c. Here we see it is not in the Power of Councils or Synods to take away any of that Power from Presbyters that God has given them, this is none of the Ecclesiastical Causes belonging to them.

This is more directly asserted by the Author of the Summary of the Controversies betwixt the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, what he says of the Episcopal Office will hold true of the Ministerial in General, "That a General Council has no Authority to give away those Rights and Powers, which are inherent in every Church, and inseparable from the Ministerial Office, for it is not in Ecclesiastical as it is in Civil Rights, Men may irrevocably grant away their own Civil Rights and Liberties, but all the Authority in the Church cannot give away it self, nor grant the whole  
"entire

"entire Episcopacy with all the Rights and Powers of it to any one Bishop.  
 "If Bishops or Presbyters will not exercise that Power, which God has given  
 "them they are accountable to their Lord for it, but they cannot give it  
 "away, neither from themselves nor from their Successors, for it is theirs on-  
 "ly to use, not to part with, and therefore every Bishop or Presbyter may re-  
 "assume such Rights, though a General Council should give them away,  
 "because the Grant is void in it self.

By ancient Ecclesiastical custom, Arch-Bishops were set over Bishops, and yet Dr. *Sherlock* confesses they have not direct Authority and Jurisdiction over them; and if Bishops have no Superiority over Presbyters, but what is grounded upon this Ecclesiastical Right, it will not amount to formal Authority. But,

2. No Power can be claimed by Ecclesiastical Right, but what has been acquired according to the Rules of those Councils and Customs by which they claim; if it be a *jus Ecclesiasticum*, they must come by it, *more Ecclesiastico*, in that method which Ecclesiastical Canons have prescribed; and nothing is more evident than that the Rules of the Primitive Churches, gave all the Presbyters, and the People too, a voice in the Election of their Bishops; the African Bishops in a Council where *Cyprian* Presided, determined that *Plures maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi*. *Cypr. Ep. 68.*  
*St. Ambrose Ep. 82. Electio & vocatio quæ sit à tota Ecclesia verè & curio est divina vocatio ad munus Episcopi.* That this was the Primitive Custom none will deny, though some Question whether this be absolutely necessary or no, and I will not say it is necessary, where the Office stands upon a Divine Institution, but certainly, where it only stands upon the Plea of Ecclesiastical Right, the Ecclesiastical Method is absolutely necessary to give that Right, for our Bishops cannot pretend to stand upon the Foundation of those Canons which they do not observe in their entrance upon that Office, since those Canons must needs bind them as much in their Acquisition of Power, as the People in their Subjection to them. *Concil. Nic. Arab. Can. Sozom. l. 1. c. 23.*

The best Title therefore our Bishops have to shew for their Prelatical Jurisdiction is the Law of the Land.

Our learned Historians and Lawyers tell us, that before *William the Conqueror* reigne, there were no such Courts in *England*, as we now call Courts Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, only by the Laws of *Ethelstane*, the Bishops were allowed to be present with the Sheriffs in their *Town Courts*, where all Ecclesiastical matters were heard and determined; Sir *Edward Cook* says, *William the Conqueror* was the first that by his Charter to the Dean and Chapter of *Lincoln* prohibited Sheriffs to intermeddle any more with Ecclesiastical Causes, but leave them wholly to the Bishop; and yet there appears no enrolment of any such Charter till the 2d. of *Rich. 1d.* And *Cook* himself mentions the Red Book of *Henry the first*, *de general. placit. Comit.* extant in the Office of the Kings Rememb. in the *Exchequer*, wherein 'tis said of the Sheriffs *Town Courts*, *Ibi agantur primo debita Christianitatis jura; secundum*  
*Brompton de Leg. Ethelst. 4. l. Institut. c. 53. p. 259.*  
 do

*do Regis placita, postremo causæ singulorum*, and he adds, certain it is the Bishops Consistories were erected, and Causes Ecclesiastical removed from the Tourne to the Consistory, after the making of the said Red Book.

Nothing will set this matter in a better Light than our Acts of Parliament, especially that of the 37. *Hen 8.* Entituled, An Act that Doctors of Civil Law being married may exercise Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; In most humble wise shew and declare unto your Highness, your most faithful, humble and obedient Subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons of this Present Parliament Assembled, That whereas your Highness is, &c. — The Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, and other Ecclesiastical Persons, who have no manner of Jurisdiction Ecclesiastical, but by, under and from your Royal Majesty — to whom by Scripture all Authority and Power is wholly given, to hear and determine all Causes Ecclesiastical, and to all such Persons as your Majesty shall appoint thereunto.

And long before this time our Kings were so tender of their Royal Rights in Ecclesiastical Matters, that when the Clergy in Parliament 51. *Edw. 3d.* Petitioned, that of every Consultation Conditional, the Ordinary may of himself take upon him the true Understanding thereof, and therein proceed accordingly (that is, without Appeal to the King, who by his Delegates by Commission under the great Seal might determine the same) the Kings Answer was That the King cannot depart with his Right, but to yield to Subjects according to Law, upon which Sir *Edw. Cook* gives an Item, *Nota hoc & fide bene.*

By the Statute, 1. *Edw. 6. 2.* The Bishops could hold no Court, but in the Kings Name, and it was no less than *Premunire* to issue out Process in their own Names, and under their own Seals, and though that Statute was Repealed in 1. *Mary 2.* Yet it lets us see the true Fountain of Prelatical Jurisdiction; and some are of opinion that it was revived in general terms in the 1. *Eliz. 1.* Which annexes and unites all Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction to the Imperial Crown of *England*, and shews that the Prelatical Power of our Bishops is wholly founded, directed and limited by the Laws of the Land.

And this is readily granted by our ablest Civilians, particularly *Godolphin* in his Abridgment of the Ecclesiastical Laws, whose words are, "No sooner had Princes in ancient times assigned and limited certain matters and causes Controversial to the Cognizance of Bishops, and to that end dignified the Episcopal Order with an Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, but the multiplicity and emergency of such Affairs require, for the dispatch and management thereof, the Assistance of subordinate Ordinaries, &c."

*Cases of Conscience.*  
1. 3. ch. 3.  
fol. 544.  
Dr. *Jeremy Taylor*, acknowledges that the Supream Civil Power is also Supream Governour over all Persons, and in all Causes Ecclesiastical, and he says, "This is a rule of such great necessity for the conduct of Conscience, as that it is the measure of determining all Persons concerning the the Sanction of Obedience to all Ecclesiastical Laws, &c. And in another place,

"place, It was never known in the Primitive Church, that ever any Ecclesiastical Law did oblige the Church unless the secular Prince did establish it. The Nicene Canons became Laws by the Rescript of the Emperor Constantine, says Sozomen. When the Council of Constantinople was finished, the Fathers wrote to the Emperor Theodosius, Petitioning *ut Edicto Pietatis tua confirmetur Synodi sententia*; The Decrees of the Councils of *fol. 600.*  
 "Ephesus and Chalcedon had the same Confirmation; as to the last, Marcion the Emperor wrote to Palladius his Prefect: *Quod ea quæ de Christiana fide à Sacerdotibus qui Chalcedoni convenerunt per nostra præcepta statuta sunt.*

And indeed what is it that the Civil Magistrate may not do in the making of a Prelate in the Church of England?

He may elect the Person, and does so in reality, for he nominates Authoritatively, and whatever some pretend, the Dean and Chapter have no power to refuse the *Congé d'élire*; and Mr. Gwin in the preface to his Readings tells us, that the King of England had of ancient time the free appointment of all Ecclesiastical Dignities investing them first *per Annulum & Baculum*, and afterwards by his Letters Patents, and that in process of time, he made the Election over to others under certain Forms and Conditions, and affirmeth with good authorities out of the Books of the Common Law, that King John was the first that granted this Liberty of Election to the Dean and Chapter, but that all Bishopricks were at first Donative.

Godolph. Re-  
pert. Canon.  
p. 42.

The Civil Magistrate may multiply Bishops *ad libitum*, and if he pleases may appoint one in every Parish; by the Statute of 26 Hen. VIII, c. 14. Six and twenty Suffragan Bishops are added to the Diocesans, as (saith the Act) hath been accustomed to be in this Realm, the Arch-Bishop or Bishop was to name two, whereof the King to chuse one, and to give him the Name Title and Dignity of Bishop, and to that Name, Title and Dignity, the Arch-Bishop with two Bishops or Suffragans more, is to consecrate him, onely he is to act by the Commission of the Diocesan, and to have none of the profits of the Bishoprick; this restraint in the exercise might have been taken off, if the Legislative Power had so pleased; And if this Law had not given them the Episcopal Power, they could not have exercised that Power, by any Commission from the Diocesan whatsoever.

He may also delegate the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction to whom he pleases, either to Lay-Men or to Presbyters; 'Tis commonly assigned to Lay-Chancellors, they do judicially Excommunicate and Absolve, and they have their Commission to do it, from the King, not from the Bishop; and in some places the Episcopal Jurisdiction is reserved to a Presbyter, as in the Peculiars, we have in divers parts of England, at Bridgnorth six Parishes are Governed by a Court held by a Presbyter; and Godolphin tells us, there are certain peculiar Jurisdictions, belonging to some certain Parishes, the Inhabitants whereof are exempted from the Arch-Deacons, and sometimes from the Bishops Jurisdiction, of which there are fifty seven in the Province of

*Canterbury*; A certain proof that the Bishops Jurisdiction is only by humane Right or Custom, because the Law can exempt some Parishes from it; but by the Citizen of *Chesters* Divinity, all these peculiars have the peculiar privilege of being unchurched, and their exemption would be tantamount to Excommunication, because they are not under the Government of the Bishop, without which there can be no Church Unity; If any say, they are under the Archiepiscopal Jurisdiction, I answer, they are no otherwise under it than the Bishops are, and the Prelatical party themselves acknowledge that Arch-Bishops are but of Humane Institution.

Lastly, The Civil Magistrate may also depose and deprive Bishops when they see just cause; and this power has been so lately exerted, that it needs no farther proof; I would fain know whether the deprived Bishops be not divested of all Episcopal Jurisdiction; Perhaps this will be thought an invidious question, and an insulting over the misfortunes of those learned Gentlemen, but I profess seriously, it is not spoken in any such Humour; Men of Tender Consciences though under a mistake, will conciliate veneration from others; The worst I wish them is, that God would shew them the evil of their former impositions upon the Consciences of their poor despised Brethren; But that which induces me to mention it is, I find the Defenders of the Hierarchy confidently assert, that there can be but one Bishop in one Church at the same time, therefore if the former be not divested of their power, I see not how the present Incumbents can have any by their own Rule, and so their Ordinations would be Null, if the others be still valid; The present Bishop of *Worcester* in his debate with Mr. *Clarkson* says it was the Inviolable Rule of the Church, to have but one Bishop in a City and Church at once, and Dr. *Morrice* labours hard to conquer Mr. *Clarkson's* objection against it, which was, That *Alexander* was made Bishop of *Jerusalem* whilst *Narcissus* lived: He says *Narcissus* took *Alexander* into the participation of the charge, but foreseeing that Mr. C. would reply, then here were two Bishops jointly governing one Church, contrary to Dr. *St's* inviolable Rule, he adds *Alexander* was the Bishop, *Narcissus* retained but the Name and Title onely, that is, was but a Titular, not a real Bishop, and it seems that was his part of the Charge, to have onely the Title and no Charge at all. Now whether *T. W.* thinks the late Bishops are the Titular and the present the Real, or on the contrary, we will not oblige him to declare, onely we guess at his Sentiments, by his calling the Late Arch-Bishop the Ruler of Gods People, above half a year after he was deprived.

Perhaps this Gentleman will satisfy himself with saying, the late Prelates have the power still, but are restrained from the exercise of it. But that would be to confront the Act of Parliament, which says expressly they are deprived of their Office, and distinguishes betwixt being suspended from the exercise of their Office, and being deprived of the Office it self, if they did not take the Oaths before the first of *August*, they were suspended from the Execution of their Office for six Months, and if then they still refused, They shall be

Def. of the  
Ans. to Dr.  
St. p. 19.

1689.  
Primo Galilæ  
& Maria.



also *facto* deprived, and are hereby judged to be deprived of their Offices, Benefices, Dignities and Promotions Ecclesiastical.

What is it then that the Civil Magistrate may not do in the making of an English Prelate? I know it will be said he cannot consecrate him, and it is the Consecration that gives the Episcopal power, but to this I have two things to return.

1. According to their own Practice, Episcopal Jurisdiction is exercised by persons never so consecrated, as by Presbyters and Lay-Chancellors in the cases before mentioned, and they have Authority given them to exercise that Jurisdiction, and that not by Deputation from the Bishop, but by Legal Constitution; and what is the Office of a Bishop, but Authority to do the work of a Bishop?

2. Since the whole Being of Episcopal power, is founded upon their Consecration, it is very reasonable to demand from them a plain Rule in Scripture for this Consecration of Bishops, as distinct from the Ordination of Presbyters; If they chuse this Foot to fix their Divine Right upon, it is necessary a clear Scripture Canon should be produced for it, but it is most certain they may turn over all the Leaves of their Bible, all the Days of their Life, before they can find any such thing.

And as the Scripture is altogether silent as to the difference betwixt the Ordination of a Presbyter and Consecration of a Bishop, (nay in the Rule for Ordination makes them the same) so this Ceremony of Consecration has not been at all times and all cases thought necessary, or practised in the making of Bishops; *Godolphin* tells us that antiently according to the Canon Law, and where the Popes Spiritual Power and Authority was in force, Bishops were not so much by Election as Postulation, and in that case the Elected was a Bishop presently, without Confirmation or Consecration, onely by the assent of the Superiour; And I have recited already the judgment of Mr. *Dodwell*, that every particular Church had a Power to invest its Bishop, and that the calling in the assistance of other Bishops, was not for want of a right in themselves to do it; I hope these Gentlemen will be more cautious how they lay the whole weight of Episcopal Authority upon Consecration, which it seems might sometimes be omitted, lest thereby they break their Line, and the neck of their cause together.

Upon the whole matter I think it is clear enough that the English Prelate is a meer Creature of the Civil Magistrate, who may make every Parson of a Parish a Bishop if he pleases, their whole power (as distinct from Presbyters) being founded upon the Laws of the Land, by the Statute 25 Hen. VIII. 19. it is declared *That none of the Clergy shall from thenceforth presume to attempt, alleadge, claim, or put in ure, any Constitutions or Ordinances, Provincial, or any other Canons, Nor shall Enact, Promulge, or Execute any such Canons, Constitutions or Ordinances Provincial, by whatsoever name or names they shall be called in their Convocations in time coming (which shall always be assembled by the Authority of the Kings Writt) unless the same Clergy may*

Repertor.  
Canon p. 49.

Sum. Rosl.  
postulat. & tit.  
si quis. Pan. 2.  
p. 106.

Supplement  
to Baker's  
Chron. p. 476.

have the King's most Royal Assent so to do, upon pain of being Fined and Imprisoned at the King's will. I need not say how severely the Canons of 40 were damned by the House of Commons, where it was resolved, *That the Clergy in a Synod or Convocation, hath no power to make Canons, Constitutions or Laws Ecclesiastical, to bind either Laity or Clergy, without a Parliament, and that the Canons are against the Fundamental Laws of this Realm, against the King's Prerogative, Property of the Subjects Rights of Parliament, and tend to Faction and Sedition.* And the Act of Uniformity has not left the Bishops power to add or change one Ceremony without the Consent of Parliament.

4. Lastly; We plead that the Civil Power has now left us to our Liberty in the case of Conformity, and therefore we are not guilty of Disobedience to Authority in what we do.

Charge of  
Schism con-  
tinued.

I know it will presently be replied, That the Act of Liberty only frees Dissenters from the Penalty of the Law, not from the Precept of it; and "there is a sharp thing written (it seems) by Mr. Norris, to prove that the only Change made by the Toleration (as he calls it) is, that the Penal part of the Law is for the present laid aside, as for the Preceptive part, that stands where it did, and obliges under sin, though not under Civil Penalty, and that Dissenters are not hereby excused from Disobedience to the State, though they be not accountable to the Law for their Non-conformity: This (as far as I can learn by his Book) he grounds upon these two Suppositions.

1. That our present Liberty extends no farther, than to the removing the Sanction of the Law.

P. 24, 32.

2. That the taking away of the Sanction, does not take away the whole Obligation of the Law: And having very civilly arraigned the Government, as doing that which it ought not to do, in granting this Liberty, and predicted, I know not what ill Consequences to the Nation and general Interest of Religion, which time will shew: He concludes with a very great Complement upon himself, that he believes the Argument has suffered no damage by the Management of it, and that he has so broken the Neck of his Adversaries Objection, that he had need to be a skilful Artist that shall set it again.

P. 78.

I must confess this is enough to discourage a man from meddling, that is conscious to himself, how little skill he has in setting broken Necks; but however, we will venture to examine the matter, and if there should chance to be no such mortal blow given, the less skill will serve to set all right again.

I could wish the Gentleman had bestowed a little more pains to make the first Point good; for the Question is not, what Toleration signifies in the strict, or forensick sense of the word, nor what Suarez says, nor how he criticizes, or distinguishes of it; for the words of the Statute are to be our Rule in discovering the Extent and Effects of it, and not the critical meaning of the word Toleration, which we have nothing to do with, being a word not to be found in the Act of Liberty from the beginning to the end of it; and

and to lay the stress of his Argument upon a bare word, which is not in the Statute, is so grand an impertinency as one would not have expected from Mr. Norris; and whatever his Admirers may say of this kind of Arguing, I am sure the Lawyers will think it receives some damage in the management.

He tells us, Where there is an Establish'd National Church, all that Toleration can do, is only to remove the Penalty, and it cannot there be a Liberty of Allowance, but only of Impunity: But what if the very Act it self expressly says it is an Allowance? why then, either there may be an Allowance to dissent from an Establish'd Church, or else this Act of Allowance destroys the Establishment; let him take whether of these Consequences he pleases, it is all one to me. The words of the Act are, "Provided always that no Congregation or Assembly for Religious Worship shall be permitted or allowed by this Act until the place of such Meeting shall be certified, &c." Here the Law says, such Assemblies so certified are allowed by this Act. Mr. Norris says, they are not allowed, I hope he will not be displeased, if we believe those favourable words of the Law, rather than his unkind contradiction.

But he says, It cannot be an Allowance, and yet if it be so, it can be so; and let him argue the Notional impossibility as long as he pleases, whilst we have the plain words of the Statute, and matter of fact to the contrary; but, says he, if it be an Allowance, the National Church is not Establish'd, why then it is not Establish'd, for an Allowance it is, if we may believe the words of the Law; and if this Act of Allowance have destroyed the former Establishment, who can help it? And yet I see no reason why the Church of England may not be Establish'd, and Nonconformity allowed too, unless by Establishment something more be meant, than that word can necessarily import: Indeed if by Establishment he mean a direct positive Command, to Worship God according to the Mode of the Episcopal Party; I grant it cannot well consist with an Allowance to Worship him otherwise; but certainly the Law is not to be set at variance with it self, it has but one Voice, and speaks distinctly and consistently, and therefore if former Laws have said, We command you all to Worship God after this manner, and a latter Law says, We allow you to Worship God after another manner, it is plain the last is the present Voice of the Law, signifying that it is not its design to tie us up to that particular Mode, and that former Command which he accounts the Establishment, cannot disannul the Allowance which comes after; but if they cannot consist together, the former must be vacated by the latter.

The Church of England has still a Legal Establishment; that is to say, she has great Privileges, large Revenues, the Publick Places of Worship, and those she has by Law; but, as Mr. Norris tells us, All that Toleration can do where there is an Establishment, is to remove the Penalty: So we may reply, All that Establishment can do or signifie, where there is an Act of Allowance,

Allowance, is only to confer such outward Privileges; and as the removal of the Penal Sanction does not always abolish the Command, so the continuance of the Præmial Sanction does not continue the Obligation of the Command, where an Act of express Allowance has taken it away.

2. His other Maxim, That the taking away of the Sanction does not take away the whole Obligation of the Law, wants a little explanation too; for though I readily grant, it will not in all cases have that effect, yet I suppose in some it may. There are certain Laws that are as well satisfied with the bearing of the Penalty, as with obeying the Precept; and Mr. Norris confesses as much concerning those Laws that are purely Penal, that is (as he says) that do not oblige absolutely to the Fact, but only conditionally either to the Fact, or to the Penalty; that there are such Laws I grant, only in this I differ from him: Whereas he says, these purely Penal Laws bind to the Penalty, I think we are not bound to the Penalty by the Authority of the Law, but only by the honour and respect due to the Law-giver; that is, a man is not bound in Conscience to suffer the Penalty if he can avoid it, without putting an affront upon the Office of the Magistracy; for by our Laws as well as the Law of Nature, no man is bound to accuse himself of any thing that has a Penalty annexed to it, especially since the repealing of the Oath *ex Officio*.

P. 50.

We are thus far agreed, that there are Laws that do not absolutely bind to the Fact: Now the Question is, Whether the Act of Uniformity and the rest, as far as they relate to Protestant Dissenters, be not some of those Laws that he calls purely Penal?

Mr. Norris well observes, That *Human Laws are not therefore purely Penal because Human*; and no question but he is so far right; Human Laws may be so just and warrantable, and advantageous to the Publick Interest, that they may formally oblige to Obedience; how then shall we find out what Laws are purely penal, and what are not so?

Truly here the Gentleman leaves us in the dark; He tells us it is by accident that any Laws are purely Penal, and not from the Specifick Nature of the Laws themselves; but these Logical terms of Accident and Specifick Nature are not so proper in matters of Law, nor are we ever the wiser in this case for them; for who can tell what Accidents those are that make this difference, since he has not been pleased to inform us? And though he adds, It is not from the different Authority of the Law, but from the different Intention of the Law-giver that any Laws are purely Penal, that is, do not oblige absolutely to the fact, yet we are never the nearer satisfaction; for if the Obliging power of these Laws depend upon the Intention and Will of the Law-giver, one would think where that Will and Intention are different, the Authority of the Law must be different, for the Authority of the Law, and its Obliging power, are the same thing; but not to contend about the Phrase, let us examine the Notion it self, which is, That it is the different Will and Intention of the Law-giver that makes any Law purely Penal; there are two inconveniencies I think attend it.

1. The

1. The Will and Intention of the Law-giver any farther than it is express'd by the words of the Law, is very doubtful and uncertain; and more especially where the Legislative Power is in the hands of so many as it is with us; for it's possible the King may intend one thing, the Lords another, the Commons a third; yea, there may be an infinite variety of Intentions amongst both Lords and Commons; and if we say the Intention of the Majority must carry it, yet by what Scrutiny shall that be found out? And if the Will and Intention of the Law-giver must be understood only by the express words of the Law, I suppose it will be hard to find any Statutes, that in express terms declare, they do not intend to bind absolutely to Obedience; and yet such Laws there are, by the Gentlemen's own acknowledgment: But

2. To say, it is the different Will and Intention of the Law-giver, that makes any Law purely Penal, will resolve the Obliging power of Human Laws into the Will of Man, which is liable to considerable prejudices. And I find this same ingenious Gentleman in another Treatise, has chosen to resolve the Obliging power of all Laws (Divine as well as Human) not into the bare will and pleasure of the Law-giver, but in the fitness of the Laws themselves to promote the common good; and this aptness, fitness or tendency to promote the common good, he tells us, is the Supream, Eternal and Irreversible Law, which prescribes measures to all the rest, and is the last reason of good and evil; and he thus analyses the immorality of an Action into its last Principles; "It is to be avoided because it is sin, it is sin because forbidden, it is forbidden because it was in it self fit to be forbidden; it was fit to be forbidden because naturally apt to prejudice the common Interest, which is above all things to be regarded and prosecuted as the best and greatest End: And though he acknowledges, Authority is to be obeyed, let the instance wherein Obedience is required, be never so indifferent, yet still, the reason of this Obligation, is not derived from the Authority of the Law-giver, but from the common good, which requires that the Supream Authority be obeyed; and yet by the way, I cannot see how his foregoing Chain of Causes, will admit of any meer positive Laws; for, did he not say, a thing is therefore forbidden, because it is in it self fit to be forbidden, as naturally apt to prejudice the common good: Now if this be so, an indifferent Action which is not naturally and in it self apt to prejudice the common good, cannot be either forbidden or commanded; for according to his Scheme, the fitness to promote the common good is not only the Reason of our obeying Laws, but the Rule of God's making them also, being (as before) the Supream, Eternal and Irreversible Law which prescribes to all the rest.

Now, if the Will of God must not be made the Ultimate Reason of our Obligation to obey his Laws, but their fitness to promote the common good, certainly the Will of Man must not be the Reason of the Obligation of Human Laws; it would be very odd and dangerous to ascribe more to the

Will

Miscellan.  
confid. of the  
Nature of  
sin, Sect. 11.  
P. 370, 371.

P. 372.



Will of Man, than to the Will of God; therefore we must enquire for some better Reason, why some Laws oblige absolutely to Obedience, and other not, than merely the different Will and Intention of the Law-giver.

And I suppose the true *raison* of this kind of Laws, is to be found in the matter of them, and those Laws are purely Penal, which require things so very trivial and indifferent, as naturally and in themselves have no fitness at all to promote the common good, nor any tendency that way; and though I dare by no means say, that this tendency to common good is a Law so supream, as that God himself must always observe it in his Commands and Prohibitions, and that the Obliging power of his Laws is to be resolved into it; for I doubt not, God may command things that have no such tendency in themselves, merely to try whether men will obey the Authority of God for its own sake; yet I am verily perswaded men should make the common good their Rule in every Law of theirs, and that amongst men; *Salus Populi est suprema Lex*, and that God has not given them Authority to command any thing, but what has a tendency thereunto: And therefore *Cicero* and others were wont to put the *bonum publicum* into the Definition of Human Laws, and to affirm that those Edicts which command things no way tending to the publick good (*quidvis potius quam Leges censenda sunt*) may be called any thing rather than Laws. It is certain God has obliged Governours to steer by the Compass of Right Reason, and to make the Point of publick good in all their Political actions; if this be the Supream Law to all men, it must be so to them; they ought never to do an act Personal, or Political, but what has such a tendency, if they do, they act against the Authority of God in this Supream Law, and therefore cannot in the same thing act with his Authority: And if in making such Laws as have no tendency to the publick good, they act without Authority, it is certain those Laws cannot bind men to Obedience, though the publick good, and a respect to the Persons and Office of their Governours, may oblige them to submit to the Penalty.

The Authority of God is absolute, is originally in himself and from himself, and therefore is not under the direction of the publick good of his Creatures; but the Authority of Man is derivative, and dependant, given unto him not for his own sake and pleasure, but for the common Interest of Mankind, and is wholly directed and limited thereby; and therefore he cannot as God make Laws purely positive, no way tending to good, but merely to try mens Obedience to his Authority; for he has no Authority to command such things, and a compliance with such Commands, may be submission, but cannot be proper Obedience. And it is observable, that there are many Statutes in *England* not repealed, and yet not regarded, because the matter of them is found to be so very trivial, that no body thinks Conscience any way concerned in them, as the Act for the tire of Wheels; that about the Age of all Calves which the Butchers kill; another requiring Butts for shooting in every Town; another, That no Bull shall be kill'd without Baiting; That none shall

*Demoistheus*  
*Natal. Comit.*  
*Mythol. l. 2. c. 7.*  
*Aquinas, q. 95.*  
*Camero praes.*  
*tom. 1. p. 367.*  
 There was  
 one (saith the  
 Bp. of *Winch.*  
 on *John 16.*)  
 that would  
 have his will  
 stand for a  
 reason, *1 Sam.*  
*ch. 2.* Thus it  
 must be, for  
*Hophni* will  
 have it so, his  
 reason is, be-  
 cause he will.  
 God grant  
 (sayeth) there  
 be none  
 such found  
 amongst  
 Christians;  
 and I say,  
*Amen.*

shall pay above a Penny for a Quart of Ale, and such like, which are buried and forgotten in their own usefulness.

The matter therefore is come to this Issue, if those things wherein we dissent from the Episcopal party, be naturally and in themselves apt to promote the common good, a meer suspension of the Sanction will not excuse us from obedience, because the Laws requiring those things, are not meer Penal Laws; But if they have no such tendency at all, then, though our Liberty were no more but a suspension of the Sanction, yet the Law being purely Penal, we are under no manner of obligation to Obedience by it.

We have therefore these two things to say for our selves under this head.

1. That the Act for Liberty amounts to more than a bare suspension of the Penalty, for it allows of our Congregations, it secures us from disturbance, laying a penalty upon all those that shall presume to do it, it exempts our Ministers from serving in any Secular Offices, which is conferring a kind of reward upon them.

I cannot but take notice, how weak and ineffectual these Gentlemen would now make this Suspension of the Penal Laws to be, and how little influence they will allow it to have upon the Preceptive part; and yet when it was their Interest in the Late King's Reign to decry the Suspension of them by the Kings Declaration onely; They pretend and plead, that if that Declaration have any Legal effect, it would discharge Ministers and People from attending upon the Publick Service of God, thus Sir Robert Sawyer Pleaded in the Bishops Trial; "When a Law is suspended the obligation thereof is taken away; Now ( my Lord ) with submission, I have always taken it, that a Power to abrogate Laws is as much a part of the Legislature as a Power to make Laws; A Power to lay Laws a-sleep and to suspend them, is equal to a Power of abrogating them, for they are no longer in Being as Laws, while they are so laid a-sleep or suspended, &c.

pag. 180,  
103.

2. Though it should amount to no more but a bare suspension of the Penalty, yet it is sufficient to excuse us from Disobedience, because the Laws hereby suspended are meer Penal Laws, that is, such as require things that are no way apt to promote the common good, those that say they are, must prove it, however here we remove the Cause out of that Court, and must stand or fall by the intrinseck worth and nature of the things commanded.

## CHAP. IV.

*The Nature and Rule of Decency; Dissenters vindicated from the charge of Indecency in Expression, Gesture and Habit; no positive Decency in the Ceremonies; Of Parochial Order; A short account of the Reasons of our Non conformity. Arguments for the imposition of Ceremonies answered.*

**I**F we come off clear in these great points of Catholick Unity, and Obedience to Superiors, we shall more easily defend our selves against the lesser imputations of Indecency and Irregularity.

We begin with that of Indecency, and therein shall enquire, first into the Nature and Rule of Decency, secondly into the Practice of the Non-conformists, and how far it is agreeable to those Rules.

We fully assent and consent, to that great Law of Decency laid down in Scripture, and believe the transgression of that as of all other Divine Laws to be absolutely sinful; We do not think it an indifferent thing whether we worship God decently or indecently; But the question is, what may be the Standard or Rule by which Decency is to be measured, our thoughts about it (such as they are) we shall lay down in a few words.

1. It must be something Antecedent to the Command of Superiors; even the Apostle himself when he commands that all things be done decently, supposes that there was a Decent way and method of acting, which they could not be ignorant of; he does not by his command make the Decency, but supposes it, and obliges them to the observation of it; We therefore conclude Decency is not a thing of meer positive institution, nor depends upon the Will and Command of Men, but is of higher Original, even the Light of Nature, and is no other but the Natural decorum of an action: To say the Ceremonies of the Church of *England* are therefore Decent because commanded, is as much as to say, were there no such command, there would be no Decency in them, and therefore that the omission of them is guilty of no other indecency than that of disobeying Superiours, and where Superiours are pleased to suspend such commands, the Worship of God may be performed as decently without them, which indeed is to set aside the Argument of decency and to betake our selves wholly to that of Obedience which has been already discussed.

2. 'Tis therefore Nature (or Custom which is a second Nature) that is the rule and measure of Decency; And Dr. *Sherlock* argues rationally upon this point, when his Adversary would suggest that there is as much necessity of an Oecumenical determination of Decency and Order, as of a National one,

one, he answers "No, for Decency of Worship is nothing else but to perform the External Acts of Worship in such a manner, as may express our Reverence and Devotion to God, therefore since there are no Catholick signs of Decency, there can be no Catholick Uniformity in these matters, The Decency of Garments, Postures, Gestures, differ in several Countries, and so do the expressions of Honour and Reverence, and therefore such external Rites being only for external Decency, and having no sacredness by institution, may vary with the different customs and usages of Countries: But as to National Churches, since the usages and customs of the same Nation, and Rules of Decency are the same, the Bishops may agree upon an Uniformity of Rites for a National Church; The sum is, it is not the Command of Superiours but the Customs of a Country that make a thing Decent, and therefore the same Rites may be commanded throughout a Nation, because the Customs upon which Decency stands are the same.

3. When we make Custom the Rule of Decency we do not mean, This or that way of Worshipping of God is Decent, because we are accustomed to Worship him so, but on the contrary, We use to Worship so, because it is Decent, that is agreeable to our custom of expressing Honour and Reverence in other cases; Otherwise we should make the same thing the Rule of it self, and say, this Worship is Decent because it is customary, and it has been our custom to Worship God thus, because it is Decent: which would be running the ring; besides, then might all the fopperies of the Roman Church set up for Decency, because they are now become customary; No actions or gestures in the Worship of God, how long soever they have been used, can plead Decency, but those which are used in other cases, as well as in Divine Service, and therefore used in the service of God, because agreeable to the general customs of Decency in other matters.

4. Nothing is required of us by the Law of Decency, but to preserve the Worship of God from all Indecencies; It is impossible to prove that we are obliged by that Law to use this or that Ceremony in the Worship of God, if it may be managed decently without them; If the Omission of such Ceremonies do not render the service of God Indecent, the Law of Decency is not broken; As no man can be charged with a breach of the Law of Justice, but he that has done some unjust thing, or of the Laws of Charity, but he that is uncharitable, so none can be charged with breaking the Laws of Decency, but he that Behaves himself Indecently in Divine Worship; As there is no medium between Justice and Unjustice, so there is none betwixt Decency and Indecency, and when of two actions one is said to be more just, the other must needs have something of injustice in it, so when one thing is more decent, the other must have something of indecency, for these things being privately opposed, admit of no medium in a capable subject.

There are some indeed tell us of certain transcendental heights of Justice, Charity and Devotion, which might be omitted without sin, thus Mr. Nor-  
 in his discourse of Heroick Piety; How they can reconcile it with the

Miscell. p. 275.

14th. Article of the Church of *England*, I cannot tell; it is like such men will pretend to the same Eminencies of Decency too, but so long as they acknowledge, we may fall short of such acme's without Sin we are well enough, the Nonconformists pretend not to such high Attainments, they would be heartily glad, could they come up to the Rule in any thing, but are so far from pretending, that they do not desire to exceed it, nor do they grudge these Gentlemen that unweildy Glory, of being wiser and better than God has commanded.

Now let us Examine the Practice of Dissenters, in their worshipping of God, and its agreeableness with the Rules of Decency; The *Chester* Gentleman falls upon the Vindicator for saying; "We desire the Rules of the Gospel may be carefully look'd into, and such a Model of Government and Worship taken from thence, as may be likely to answer the great ends thereof, that nothing may be imposed, but either what is expressly commanded, or has a natural and proper tendency to promote that which is so, then would the Worship of God appear like it self, Rational, Grave and Majestical, becoming reasonable Creatures to offer, and a Being of perfect Simplicity, and Spirituality to accept; Nor would we as we are accused under pretence of Spirituality, reject the natural Decorum of an Action in Divine Worship, but only lay aside these Formalities that are over and above natural Decency, which in Civil Converse are counted Foppish, and daily grow out of repute betwixt man and man, and are no where so improper as in the Service of God.

Now what harm is there in all this, the Gentleman it seems has nothing to object against it, but all the Question is, Whether the Worship of God in our Conventicles be as agreeable to this Rule, as their is in the Churches; and no doubt he thinks the Case is half determined, by the very Names Churches and Conventicles; for is it imaginable that men should worship God as decently in a Conventicle, as in the Church? All the Club will say, and swear too 'tis impossible; but what if our Assemblies are as much Churches as theirs, and theirs as much Conventicles as ours; 'tis true enough for any thing he has yet produced to the contrary; Mr. *Hales* tells us, that all pious Assemblies in times of Persecution and Corruption are the only lawful Congregations, and the publick Assemblies though according to form of Law, are indeed nothing but Riots and Conventicles, if they be stained with Corruption and Superstition.

He charges the Dissenters with Indecency, 1. In their Expressions. 2. In their Gestures. 3. In their Habits.

1. In Expression, because our Ministers use not a stated form of Prayer, and therefore he accuses them of *Rushing into the presence of God with the rash and sudden thoughts of one single Person, with a Prayer newly Coined, but whether Sterling or no, is uncertain, being never tried, for the People know it not till it be out.*

But must it needs follow, that because we have not a form laid before us, that



that our thoughts are therefore rash and sudden, is he sure that we never use Premeditation both as to the general Method and Matter of Prayer? And for the words if they be usually Scripture Phrase, I hope they will pass for current in a more equal Ballance than his; Will this Gentleman say, that all conceived Prayer is rash and irreverent? Then I am sure he will condemn the most learned and pious Divines, yea and Bishops too of the Church of England, who in the Pulpit commonly use such Prayers, and sometimes of a considerable length too, which we may be sure they would not do, if they thought it impossible for the People to joyn with them in it; and if the Duty of Prayer may be performed rationally and gravely without a prescribed form, this Objection vanishes into putrid Air.

If this Gentleman would only say that He and his Companions, cannot express themselves rationally and reverently in the presence of God, without a prescribed form of Words, we would not contradict them, they best know what they can do, but to say, that without such a form, it is impossible to perform this Duty aright, is (as the Vindicator speaks) little less than Lam-poon upon the common sense of English men; and I am sure it is contrary to the whole scope of that excellent Book of Bishop Wilkins called the Gift of Prayer; for my part I thank God, for the acquaintance I have had, with some plain poor People, that in their Prayers to God would express themselves in much more proper and pertinent Language, than this Gentleman has yet attained to, though he be the Author of at least two famous Books.

2. In our Gestures; that in Prayer they are confused, and irreverent, I know not what he intends by these Words, We judge it our Duty either to kneel or stand, in the time of Prayer, either of which are postures of Adoration, and to sit or loll we utterly disallow, unless in case of bodily weakness and inability, where they are excused, by that Rule, God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice; I wonder, how this Gentleman should come to know our postures, better than we do our selves. I suppose he has seldom appeared in our Assemblies, unless it was in former days, when he came attended by his Setters to break them up, and then perhaps the Terror of such a One might put the People into postures odd and confused enough, but if he pleases to come now, when his Thunder-bolts are spent, he may satisfy himself that our Gestures are almost as grave, though not so genteel as his own.

But it seems the Dissenters sit and loll, and are covered, at the reading of the Psalms; as for sitting, I know not why it should be more irreverent at the reading of the Psalms, than other parts of Scripture, or than at the singing of the Psalms, and at such times, I am sure in Churches they generally sit.

And that we are usually covered, either at the Reading or Preaching of the Word is not true, and yet I know of no great Crime in it, especially in S. B. Esq. 7th  
Infirm and Aged Persons; but I shall refer him to what a Learned Gentle-  
man of the Church of England, says in this Case, his Words are, "Though  
Providence of  
God observed,  
p. 28.  
the

"the Act for enjoying the Common Prayer, forbids both Affirmatively  
 "and Negatively any other Method or Form of Service Rites and Ceremo-  
 "nies than is there directed; some Churchmen are great Nonconformists in  
 "disobeying that Rule, by several Additions in approach to Popery, as in  
 "their second Service, &c. As also in being superabundant to Popery, in  
 "endeavouring to make a Superstitious Fashion, to sit bare during Sermon,  
 "which is but a new thing in England, and not known in any other Christi-  
 "an Church, for though the Papists are bare in their Churches out of Ser-  
 "vice-time, whom we endeavour to imitate in that Circumstance, yet they  
 "are covered during Sermon, wherein we outdo them; and he tells us, That  
 "the Minister of *Finchley* not long since caused one to be committed for being  
 "covered, whilst he was in his Sermon, who bringing his Action against  
 "the Justice for false Imprisonment recovered good Damages of him; which  
 "though sufficient to prove the Churches Usurpation in this matter, they  
 "do notwithstanding go on in it, as a part of that new Popery formerly in-  
 "tended by *Laud* in his time.

But the Gentleman is chiefly scandalized at our Gesture in receiving the  
 Reply, p. 46. Sacrament, wherein (he says) we sit like Clowns and Bumkins; but who  
 told him that we sit so Clownishly? A man may sit very decently and hand-  
 somely, and how does he know, but we do so? I hope merely sitting is not  
 the thing that makes a Bumkin, for then this Gentleman is forced to be a  
 Bumkin almost all the day long; nor sitting in the Service of God, for that  
 he does too; and why it should have such a peculiar Rustical quality at the  
 Lords Supper, rather than in other Ordinances I cannot imagine; especially  
 when for any thing that appears, our Saviour used it in the very Institution  
 of the Ordinance, and the Apostles even when they received it from his im-  
 mediate hand, and though I am not of their minds, that think this makes  
 sitting necessary, yet I am sure it will at least defend it from the scandal of an  
 irreverent Posture.

3. The Habit of our Ministers is not pleasing; For (says he) *He who  
 administers in their Divine Service, as they call it, has no other habit than  
 what is due to, and becomes a Tradesman or any other Laick in the Congrega-  
 tion.*

And here again, we have Reason to complain that the matter of Fact is  
 not truly represented, for our Ministers are generally distinguished from  
 others, by the use of that very antient Garment the Cloak, of which *Tertu-  
 lian* has writ a Treatise, and prefers it before the Gown, as a more modest  
 humble Attire, inasmuch as that, a *Toga ad Pallium*, became a Proverb to  
 express a Person growing humble, from which *Beatus Rhenanus* argueth  
 against the costly Wardrobe of the Prelates, as not being a *toga ad pallium*,  
 but a *pallio ad togam, ad purpuram, ad mundi pompam*. And what if Laicks  
 wear Cloaks too, so do Lawyers wear Gowns, and the singing Men and  
 Boys have their Surplices, and yet I suppose they are not thereby advanced  
 above the Condition of Laicks; why then is not our habit as grave, though  
 not as Majestical as theirs? The

*Tertul. de pal-  
 lio. p. 490.*

The Gentleman seems to be exceedingly enamoured of the Surplice, and passionately cries out, should the Church condescend to gratifie your humour to strip the Priest of his Habits, the Emblem of Innocency, and Colour of the Robe in St. John's Vision? I must Confess, 'tis Pity the Priest should not be Innocent, and Heavenly at least in Emblem; and yet we find the learned men of his Church, make but a very small account of this Visional Holy Garment; The Bishop of *Worcester* says, "As for the Surplice in Parochial Churches, it is not of that consequence, as to bear a dispute one way or another; and elsewhere, I am sure it is contrary to the Primitive Practice, to suspend and deprive Men of their Ministerial Functions, for not conforming in Habits, Gestures, and the like; and *Wulfridus Strabo* expressly tells us, there was no distinction of Habits used in the Primitive times; and the *Council Gangrense* condemned *Eustatius Sebastianus* for making a necessity of the Diversity of Habits; and we find *Justin Martyr* in *apostolicum* *manuscriptum*, Preaching the Gospel in his Philosophers Habit; and if after all this we must be condemn'd for irreverent Clowns and Bunkins, it will be some comfort to us, that we shall suffer in very good Company.

In short, The most Learned Conformists, that have largely writ in Vindication of these Ceremonies, acknowledge there is nothing of real goodness in them, nothing of Positive Order, Decency or Reverence, for which they ought to be commanded: The Church her self declares them to be indifferent, which they cannot be, if the worship of God might not be decently performed without them.

Bishop *Sanderfon*, whose Learning and Spirit were both high and great enough, expressly says, "If any man shall wear a Surplice, or Kneel, or Cross, with an Opinion of necessity for Conscience sake towards God, as if those parts of Gods Service could not be rightly performed without them, yea though our Church had not appointed them, doubtless the use of such Ceremonies by Reason of such his Opinion, would be Superstitious to him; this is full to our purpose, we have the suffrage of this great Prelate, that we may Worship God every whit as well without these Ceremonies, and if *T. W.* thinks otherwise, one of his own Fathers has condemned him for Superstition.

*Dr. Patrick* in his Friendly Debate speaks to the same effect; "Then do we make the Ceremonies parts of Divine Worship, when we suppose them to be so necessary, that the doing them would be a thing pleasing to God, and the omitting of them would be a thing displeasing to him, although there were no Humane Law, that required the doing of them.

Now we may thus argue, If it were indecent to omit these Ceremonies, it would be displeasing to God, who has commanded that all things be done decently; but we see the Defenders of Ceremonies, when they are put to it have no way to defend themselves from the guilt of Superstition, and of instituting new parts of Divine Worship, but by declaring, that these things are in their own Nature purely trivial, and the using of them would not be

*Christof. of Separat. Pref. p. 83. Item. p. 64.*

*De rebus Eccl. cap. 24.*

*Can. 14.*

*Protest. Recon. p. 41.*

*Sermon in Mat. 15. 9. p. 20, 21.*

*P. 215.*

at all pleasing to God, nor the Omission displeasing, were they not commanded and enjoyed by humane Laws, that is to say, the Worship of God is not at all the more decent for them, nor the less decent without them.

4. We come to the point of Order, and here indeed we are most blamed by the sober Conformists, as acting irregularly, setting up distinct Assemblies in Parishes, and drawing away the People from the Parish Minister, gathering Churches out of Churches, which the Presbyterians formerly condemned in others.

To this we Answer, That we really approve of all Prudent Rules for the more orderly and effectual Management of the Ministerial Function, and in ordinary Cases, we judge it convenient that the Charge of a Minister should be confined within such bounds, as our Parishes, but we do not think this to be a matter of that Consequence, as strictly to oblige us in all circumstances of Affairs, and the Vindicator mentioned several Cases, wherein this Order may be transgressed without Sin, to which the Gentleman has not made the least reply.

*Defence of Plural. p. 59.*

The Learned Writers of their own party, tell us, that the Division of Churches by Parishes is of a later date, and we know it is not so nicely observed by themselves, but that many Chappels of Ease have been set up, and filled with People of divers adjacent Parishes, the Ministers sometimes celebrating both the Sacrament, and no Exceptions taken, and why may not our Assemblies be look'd upon as such? If it be said these Chappels are all under the Parish Minister, yet it cannot be denied but they may be freed from that dependance by Law, and made distinct Churches, and exempted from the Jurisdiction of the Parson or Bishop as several places already are; unless we will with *Pythagoras* curse the Number two, because it was the first that did depart from Unity.

But we acknowledge it were more desirable to have the Parochial way observed, interest, as well as a due regard to Order, would invite us to it, if we could comply with those terms that are required of us in Order thereunto; Our Case is plainly this, The Laws of the Land allow us to Assemble in other places, upon such Qualifications as we heartily approve of, but admit us not into the Publick Churches, without such a further compliance as we cannot in Conscience come up unto.

I must confess, this is that part of the Controversie, which I have the least Mind to meddle with, not because it is the most difficult, but because it may seem to reflect upon the Wisdom or Integrity of many Worthy Learned Conformists, of whom I would not speak or think without due respect; but the importunate clamours of this Gentleman, and men of his temper extort it from us, he is often challenging us at this Weapon, as in his Reply, p. 4. "If these men have any thing imposed upon them by our Governours that is sinful, let them shew it, and their Plea must be allowed, but they are forced to confess, the terms of Obedience imposed are but indifferent things, meer trifles, now for a man to disobey his Governours and have no other

other Plea but this, is too mean an excuse from the Transgression of a known Law; This he seems to express with a great Elevation of Mind, as if it were a killing Sentence, when indeed it is as foolish and inconsiderate, as his Adversaries can desire. For,

1. It is not true, that we confess the terms of Conformity to be things Indifferent, when the Vindicator says they are such by acknowledgment, he plainly speaks of the Acknowledgment of the Imposers, not of the Dissenters, and no Body can understand it otherwise, but those that have a mind to be mistaken.

2. Our Governours do not now impose such things upon us, as terms of Obedience, and therefore all the noise he makes about Childrens disobeying their Parents, because they suspect the Lawfulness of their commands, is out of doors, and yet by the way, he would be a very severe Father, that should force his Son upon the highest Penalties to do a thing, which he himself confesses is altogether needless, and good for nothing, especially when the Son really suspects it to be unlawful, and thinks he cannot do it without displeasing God; all the World would condemn the Barbarity of such a Father; Blessed be God, the illustrious Parents of our Countrey, are too just and merciful to command such things; our Nonconformity is indeed a loss to our selves, but no disobedience to our Superiours, as has been already argued at large.

*Cruetis Pater  
magis quam  
Pater improbus  
ille —*

The Authors of the Enquiry and Vindication, waved this Point of the Sinfulness of Conformity, out of meer Respect and Civility to their Brethren that are otherwise minded, and chose rather to insist upon those general precepts of Love and Charity towards weak and scrupulous Consciences, which the Scripture abounds with, being willing to admit that we are mistaken in these matters, rather than to expose the mistakes of others, but this Gentleman had not the Civility to make a suitable return, but encourages himself, by that Modesty of theirs to insult, and hector, and cry aloud, for proof of the sinfulness of Conformity, declaring that they will admit of no other Plea,

But what if terms of Conformity be not sinful, it is sufficient for us, that we are under no Obligation to comply with them; our Governours have left us at our Liberty, and though the Bishops may still command them, yet our own Pastors are as truly Bishops as they; The Unity of the Church does not depend upon them, but may be much better preserved without them, and the Act of Liberty in the Preamble, declares, that it is the Sense of the King, Lords and Commons, that not Conformity, but ease to scrupulous Consciences may be an effectual means to unite Protestants in Interest and Affection, and the Worship of God may be as decently performed without them; how are we then obliged to comply with such things? Will he say it is our Duty to use all those Ceremonies and Customs in the Worship of God that are not sinful? What if a Papist should ask him; Why do you not Conform to all the Ceremonies of our Church? Why do you not use Salt and Cream, and Spittle, in Baptism? Why do you not Cross your Breasts, and Shave your

L

Heads?



Heads? Can you prove these things to be sinful? I suppose this Gentleman would reply, we care not whether they be sinful or no, we are not obliged to use them; and if the Papist should alledge the Command of the Catholick Church, he would reply, No Forreign Prelate, or Potentate has Authority to enjoyn such things upon us, and our own Governours have not done it; if the other should urge, that we must comply for Unity sake, he would answer, The Unity of the Church lies not in Uniformity of such Rites and Ceremonies; if the Papists should press it further, These are decent Ceremonies, and serve to excite in men devout thoughts of God and Christ, and have rare mystical Signification, surely He would rejoyne, The Worship of God is managed by us very decently without such things.

Thus we say in answer to his demand, if we be not obliged to Conformity, though it should not be unlawful, our Nonconformity is very justifiable; therefore this Plea of the Sinfulness of the thing, is not now so necessary as he imagines; but lest we should seem to acknowledge that we had nothing to justify our practice heretofore, when Conformity was required by the Law. And that we are still for an unaccountable Singularity, and are resolved to differ from others meerly for distinction sake, and have no regard to Parochial Order, which we have formerly seemed to approve of; I shall venture to say something upon this point, though I am sensible before-hand some will blame me for saying so much, and others for saying no more.

The World is not to seek for the Reasons of our Nonconformity, a large Account has been given thereof in a Multitude of Treatises, some of which have received no answer at all, as Dr. Rule's *Rational Defence*, and Mr. Baxter's *English Nonconformity Stated and Argued*; wherein the Case is so copiously and yet so closely debated, in the several particulars both of Ministerial and Lay-Conformity, that it seems wholly superfluous to add any thing, till we see what answer will be made unto it; I have seen indeed a little impertinent Scribble of two or three Sheets of Paper, wherein the Author pretends not to engage in the Controversie, but only tells us with Confidence enough, that Mr. Baxter's Book is an unnecessary, unseasonable and unaccountable Undertaking, and has been already answered, which is a very quick and cheap way of confuting Dissenters, and the common reply of every baffled Party, to all that is writ against them, and is only taken up as a little shift to serve an easie and credulous sort of Men amongst themselves, but can never be designed to give Satisfaction to others; and if such Trifles must pass for an Answer to a Book so Large, Distinct and Argumentative, as Mr. Baxter's is, truly it is to no purpose either to write or read Controversie.

There are three Steps a man must take before he can arrive at the height of English Conformity: 1. He must submit to the Use and Practice of the Impositions. 2. He must declare his Approbation and good liking of them. 3. He must Swear never to endeavour any Alteration, some of us stumble at the First, many stick at the Second, but the Last is most inaccessible.

1. Many

1. Many of us can by no means be satisfied with the constant Use and Practice of these controverted Matters, and that for these Reasons amongst others.

1. We observe, That the great Corruption of Churches has in all Ages risen from this Source, introducing unnecessary Ceremonies in the worship of God, teaching for Doctrines the Traditions of Men; this had reduced the Jewish Church to that Leprous condition wherein it lay in our Saviour's time: And the grand Apostacy of *Rome* begun by advancing the Power of Ecclesiasticks beyond its measure, and exerting it in the Invention and Imposition of such Mystical Rites and Ceremonies, and by adding still thereunto, it grew up to such a Mystery of Iniquity, and Monster of Usurpation and Tyranny, as it appears at this day in the World; and we know not of any Specificall Difference betwixt the Ceremonies in *England* and those of *Rome*, and we could never prevail with our Antagonists to give us a Rule to distinguish them by.

It is usually said ours are but few, but theirs are many, and therefore burthensom; but this does not satisfy; for many or few alters not the kind, and if it be lawful to use Three, why not Six, Twenty or a Hundred? besides, if ours be therefore better because they are fewer, I hope they will give us leave to infer, the fewer Ceremonies and the better, and therefore best of all where there are none; if the Matter must be resolved into their Positive decency, we have already shewed by their own Confession there is no such decency in them, but the worship of God may be managed as well without them: But if the Matter be fixed upon the Churches Authority, then let the Church command never so many we must comply, and so are as much enslaved to the humours of the Ecclesiasticks as the Papists themselves; and the case standing thus, we think none can justly blame us if we are afraid of contributing to the return of Superstition and Arbitrary Church-Power, by entertaining and embracing those things, that have given it rise and strength in other Parts and Ages of the World. Our Objection against them is not that weak and silly thing some represent it, as if we reject them meerly because the Papists use them; but we do it because the Imposition and use of them has given Life and Growth to the Papacy.

2. Especially since they are altogether useless, and have no tendency to promote that which is good, this much strengthens the prejudice, they have done a great deal of harm, and they can do no good by the Confession of the Imposers, and we cannot imagine why they should be retained, since they are neither good in themselves, nor have a natural fitness to promote the Common Good; were there any usefulness in them, we would not reject them, meerly because they have been abused, but since by their own acknowledgment the Worship of God is not at all the better performed for them, we cannot but judge it irrational to retain them; a Wise Man will do nothing deliberately in his common Conversation but what he can give some account *cui bono*, to what end he does it; And really it is somewhat a hard

case that we are in if we use these Ceremonies, and know before hand, our Duties are never the better for them, Conscience and Reason tell us we are guilty of trifling in a Matter of the greatest Solemnity, if we use them with an opinion that the Worship of God is better performed with them, than otherwise, their own Bishops and Doctors tell us we are guilty of Superstition and Will-worship.

3. We observe that the Dealers in Ceremonies are apt to grow upon us, and if we yield to a few, they still urge us with more; and indeed the Principle upon which they are defended, leaves room to bring in as many as they please, provided they be not expressly prohibited in the Word of God, which in things of this Nature is not to be expected; for it had been an endless task, and would have swell'd our Bibles, to a Prodigious Bulk, to have precluded them all by Name, which may be as various and indefinite as the fancies of Men; Thus our Canons enjoyn several things which are not required by Law, as bowing at the Altar at the Name of Jesus, reading some part of the Service at the Communion Table, &c. and the Practice of some Zealous Men outgoes the very Canons themselves. We are very loth to launch out into so vast an Ocean, and commit our selves to be tost up and down by the Caprices and Humours of Men, which are as uncertain as the Winds and Waves, and we know not upon what dangerous Rocks, or remote Shores, they may at length drive us.

4. Those things which we scruple, are disapproved by the best Reformed Churches; we know it to be so from their own words; when the Ministers of the Helvetian and French Churches were desired to give their Opinion about these things, they did generally express their dislike of them; See a Book intitled, *The Judgment of the Reformed Churches*, Printed at Geneva, Octob. 24. 1547. Subscribed by Beza, and many famous Divines of those Churches.

And we cannot forget the Exhortation of the poor Remains of the *Bohemian* Churches, directed to the Reformed, especially to that of *England*, by the Learned and Pious *Comenius*, writ in Latine, and Dedicated to King *Charles II.* at his return into *England*, I will transcribe a few Lines because the Book is not in every Bodies hand.

P. 8.

"Contend then, Oh great Churches! among your selves, if you please, about the Preheminence; Strive about the Notion of Faith, or for Ceremonies, or the Hierarchy as fiercely as you can; behold God presents you with a little Child, an Infant stript of all Pomp and Dressing, considerable for nothing but for Simplicity, knows not any thing of preferring it self before others, or quarrelling with any, or coveting Wealth and Honours, only understands how to keep at home, to do its own Business, not to intermeddle in other Mens Matters, but to Serve God in Spirit and in Truth, &c.

P. 47-

And in another Place thus: "As for the Pomp of Church Ceremonies, God indeed in the old way of Worship ordained such a thing, therein by  
"Shad-

"Shadows to set forth the Spiritual Mysteries of Salvation, which Christ  
 "at his coming was to disclose; but seeing that since the coming of Christ,  
 "they have been demolished and levelled, by so many Apostolical Strains, as  
 "Claps of Thunder and Flashes of Lightning directed against them, why  
 "should we bring them up again still to make use of them? Under the Pa-  
 "pacy perhaps where the Light of the Gospel is obscured, in their Barbarous  
 "Generations, they might seem to be of some use, at least with some colour-  
 "able pretence; but in a Reformed Church, I beseech you, what use can  
 "be made of them? Those that have been hitherto retained in *England*  
 "under the Reformed Bishops, have not the very Pontificians themselves  
 "laught them to Scorn and Derision? It is plain to be seen in *Wesley's*  
 "*Theatre of Life Civil and Sacred*, Printed at *Antwerp* 1626. P. 564. &c.  
 "Where having said that the Religion of the Protestants is without all Re-  
 "ligion, because they have no Sacrifice, Priesthood nor Sacred Ceremonies,  
 "he adds, Some Protestants indeed, that they may not appear absolutely  
 "Impious and Irreligious, use our Missal and Breviary, selecting what they  
 "please thereof for the Rubrick of their Liturgy, and to make the Form of  
 "their Worship appear the more goodly, they have their Canonical Persons  
 "forsooth, after the Modes and Customs of the Church of *Rome*, their Caps,  
 "and Hoods and Holy-Days, and such-like Stuff, which they say they found  
 "in the Synagogue of Antichrist; by which very thing it is apparent that  
 "the Religion of these Protestants stands guilty of Stealth and Robbery, by  
 "which it first came into the World, or if they will not be taken for Thieves,  
 "let them go for our Apes: These with their whole Service are derided and  
 "scorned not only by ours, but also by their own; the English seem to have  
 "driven the Pope out of *England* in such haste that they have forced him to  
 "leave his Cloaths behind him, which they as Fools in a Play, put on with  
 "a kind of Pompous Ceremony of Triumph, and so lead the Quire, a goodly  
 "Reformation it is that they dare not carry it through, &c.

"It will therefore be a glorious thing for the Reformed Churches to come  
 "back to the Practice of Christ and his Apostles, leaving off the Baubles of  
 "earthly Riches, Honours and Pomp, and to look after and busie themselves  
 "about things of a higher Nature, &c. This and a great deal more to the  
 "same purpose is there to be seen, by which it appears, not only that those  
 "renowned Martyrs and Confessors called the *Taborites*, disliked our Ceremo-  
 "nies, but that the Papists themselves, for whose sake they are retained, de-  
 "spise and ridicule us for them.

2. There are those amongst us that could bear with the use of these things,  
 but cannot declare their Approbation of them, and their Assent and Consent  
 to all of them; this would be to espouse and commend those things which  
 at best they look upon but as *Tolerabiles Ineptiæ*, and this Approbation  
 must extend to all things required; and they cannot so far dissemble with  
 God and the World.

There are many things in the Book of Homilies which they like very well,  
 but

P.<sup>1</sup> 160.

but they cannot say so of all; there are some very odd Passages, which they cannot Assent to; take one instance of many, 2 *Hom.* of Alms. *The same Lesson doth the Holy Ghost teach us in sundry places of Scripture, saying, Mercifulness and Alms-giving purgeth from all Sin, delivereth from Death and suffereth not the Soul to come into darkness; alledging for it, Tobit 4. v. 10. and the saying of the Son of Syrach, That Alms maketh an Atonement for Sin.*

There are many good Petitions in the Liturgy, and good Directions in the Rubrick, which we could (some of us) freely use; but we cannot prevail with our selves to Assent to that Notorious Mistake in the Rule for finding *Easter*, nor can we digest that Complemental Prayer, *Those things which for our Unworthiness we dare not, and for our blindness we cannot Ask, vouchsafe to give us for the worthiness of thy Son.*

Tobit ch. 3.  
ch. 5. and 6.

There are excellent Lessons taken out of Scripture and appointed to be Read, which our Ministers would gladly do, but we cannot approve of those fustian Apocryphal Tales, about *Sarah* the Daughter of *Reguel*, and her infernal Spark *Asmodeus*, that killed all her Husbands before they lay with her, till at length the Angel *Raphael* put them into a way to get rid of the Amorous Fiend, by burning the Intrails of a Fish, which it seems had such a Super-sulphureous stench, that the Devil himself could not endure it, but quits the Room and his Mistress to the enjoyment of his Rival *Tobias*; I might take notice of the strange and self-contradicting Stories that this pretended Angel told them; Of the many odd and gross things we have in *Judith* and in *Ecclesiasticus*, as where we are dissuaded from receiving Strangers

*Ecclesi.* ch. 11.  
v. 34. To be  
read *Or.* ch. 25.

to our Houses; for, says the Book, *He will disturb thee, and turn thee out of thy own;* and we are bid *give Alms only to the Godly, but help not a Sinner, give not to the ungodly, hold back thy Bread, and give it not to him, for the most High hateth Sinners;* let all Mankind judge how contrary this is to our Saviour's Command, *Love your Enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you—that you may be like your Father which is in Heaven; for he maketh his Sun to rise upon the Evil and the Good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.*

To be read,  
*Or.* ch. 30.  
*Concil.* Laod.  
can. ult.  
ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ  
ἀγαθὴν καὶ  
βελτίαν ἀλλὰ  
μὴ τὰ κακο-  
νικά. τῶς πα-  
λαιάς καὶ κα-  
νὼς διατάξεις.

And yet this Apocryphal Doctrine is appointed to be Read in Churches as a Lesson, which I fear too many have learned; and this is part of the Book to which we must subscribe, as containing nothing contrary to the Word of God, and the Preface to the Common-Prayer Book says nothing is ordained to be Read but the very pure Words of God, or that which is agreeable to them, to which we must likewise Assent. Many more such Passages might be, and have been mentioned, which contain things false, or odd and ridiculous, and wholly unfit to take up a place in so Sacred a Thing as the Worship of God.

There are many amongst us, that would willingly submit to a Moderate Episcopacy, according to Archbishop *Usher's* Reduction; but we cannot declare our Approbation of delegating the Power of the Keys to Lay Men, nor dare



dare our Ministers promise to Publish all such Excommunications as they send out, which may sometimes be levell'd at the most Sober religious Persons in the Parish, nor dare they consent to Publish the Absolution of Notorious Debauchees who have given no other Proof of Repentance, besides Paying the Fees of the Court; we dare not trifle with such things as these, nor expose the Censures of the Church to that Scandal and Contempt they lye under by reason of such Practices.

When this Case was proposed to the Ministers of the Helvetian Churches before-mentioned, *That the Keys of binding and loosing, are not used by the judgment of the Presbyters, according to the Word of God, but by certain Lawyers, and made a Money Business;* and their advice was desired, how far these things ought to be complied with. They seem to be amazed at the thing, as altogether incredible, and answer, "That though things which are ill done  
"by one Party, may be born with by another, while they cannot change  
"or reform them; yet if they shall be forced not only to bear, but to ap-  
"prove such things, and to Assent to so manifest an Abuse, we then exhort  
"them that they will rather suffer any kind of Trouble, than act herein  
"against their Consciences.

*Judgment of  
Foreign Di-  
vines, p. 16.*

3dly, We must not only use and approve these things, but must Swear, That we will not endeavour any Alteration in the Government of the Church; this the *Oxford Act* requires of us, and that in terms as Universal as can be, and leaves us no liberty to explain our selves, or to say that we will not endeavour by any unlawful means to do it: And we remember very well how the Marquess of *Argyle* was dealt with, for putting such a sence upon the like words. It is not long since a Great Prelate of our Church openly declared, That the Spiritual Courts are the great Grievance of the Nation; and it is very hard we must be obliged to Swear, that we will not at any time endeavour the redress of such a Common Nuisance, that we must not Study, Write, or Petition for it; this was a clenching blow indeed to fasten and entail all the faults of the Constitution upon our Selves and our Heirs for ever. This is a brief Account of those things that have made us Nonconformists, and now keep our Ministers out of the Parish Churches; those that would see them more largely and strongly and particularly argued, are remitted to the Books before mentioned.

Let us now see what the Gentleman has said to Vindicate these Impositions, and then I'll bid him farewell till we meet again.

1. He endeavours to justify them, by the like Practice amongst the Presbyterians, mentioning Three significant Ceremonies imposed by them at the taking of the Covenant, *viz.* The Person must be uncovered, must stand up, and the right hand must be lifted up bare; and these, he says, were terms of Communion amongst them.

Now really for my part I am much confirmed in my dislike of these controverted Impositions, because I find the Defenders of them are forced instead of justifying, to recriminate, and all they have to say, is the Presby-

terians

terians were as bad as they, when they had the Power in their hands ; and if there be any Strength in such a Reply, it concludes against themselves for doing that which they condemn in others, and all that it proves is, that all Parties have been at one time or other transported into unreasonable Severities against each other, and surely then 'tis time for all to amend, unless they resolve to perpetuate these Quarrels, and to act them alternately in an Endless round.

There are not many Dissenters now alive that remember any thing of those days, and fewer that were any way concerned in them ; And many of those that were at that time most zealous in urging the Covenant, and Engagement and Abjuration, were the first that turn'd with the Times, and became as Troublesome and Vexatious on the other Side ; and yet the instance which this Gentleman brings ought to be a little examined, for 'tis neither Pertinent nor True as to Matter of Fact.

It is not pertinent, because not appertaining to the ordinary Worship of God; that which he calls the Rebellious Covenant, was a Solemn Oath whereby Men bound themselves to endeavour in their Places a Reformation both in Church and State, according to the Word of God, and particularly to preserve the King's Person ; pursuant to which Clause, Thousands of Scotch and English hazarded all that was dear to them on the behalf of the Royal Family, it was deliberately and voluntarily taken by King *Charles* the Second, who professed himself deeply humbled for his Father's Opposition to it, and that upon full perswasion of the Justice and Equity of all the Articles thereof, he had Sworn and Subscribed it, and was resolved to adhere thereunto to the utmost of his Power, and to prosecute the Ends of it all the days of his life : And it is certain, the Restoration of that Prince is very much owing to the Sence which a great many had of the binding Power of that Covenant ; as *Mr. Crofton* shews in his Defence of it against *Dr. Gauden*.

Now this being a Solemn Oath, must needs as all other Oaths, require some signal Expression of Consent, according to the Custom of all Civilized Nations ; in some this Consent is signified *Viva voce* ; in some by kissing the Book, in *Scotland* by lifting up the Hand, and as we had the Covenant from thence, so their Signification of Consent was used also, being more suitable for the expressing the Joynt Consent of a Multitude, than any other ; but this is nothing to Mystical Ceremonies in the stated Worship of God ; if no more had been required of us in the late Troublesome Times than to kiss the Book when we were called to take an Oath, there would not have been many Dissenters, excepting those that scruple Swearing upon any Account.

Besides, it is not true, that this Covenant with the manner of taking of it, was ever imposed as a term of Communion. The House of Commons indeed, and the Assembly of Divines took it, and most of those that held any Office of Profit or Trust, but it was never imposed upon any on Pain of Excommuni-

Royal Declar-  
at Dumfer-  
ling, Aug. 16.  
1650.

Excommunication or Suspension from the Lord's Supper ; it was to be tendered to all in general, and an Exhortation drawn up for the satisfying of those that might scruple the taking of it, but it was forced upon none by any Penalties Corporal or Spiritual ; if the Ceremonies and Subscriptions had been no otherwise imposed, it had been happy for us. The Presbyterians neither imposed nor used any Mystical Ceremonies of their own devising in the Worship of God, they never tied Men up to the Words of their Directory, nor required any to Subscribe to it, or declare their Assent and Consent to all things therein contained ; they never obliged Persons to Swear against endeavouring an Alteration, but bound themselves to promote a Reformation of whatever should be found to be contrary to the Word of God ; and therefore they gave no Pretexts for what has been done against them in the late Reigns.

*Rushworth's  
Coll. Part. 3.  
P. 475.*

2. The Gentleman tells us, the Apostles made meer Ceremonies Terms of Communion in their days ; which is not true, and yet if it were, would not justify others in doing so, who have not the Commission and Power which the Apostles had.

The Gentleman instances in having all things Common in their Love-Fests, and in the holy Kiss, and affirms, that these were meer Ceremonies imposed by the Apostles as terms of Communion ; but he's miserably out all along.

As to the Custom of having all things common, nothing more evident than that it was a thing purely voluntary, and imposed upon none. St. Peter tells *Ananias*, Whilst it remained it was his own, and after it was Sold it was in his Power, he might have done with it what he pleased ; but the Sin was Lying against the Holy Ghost, in pretending they had dedicated the whole to God when part was kept back ; surely this was more than the omission of a meer Ceremony.

*Acts 5. 4.*

And he is not more happy in the second instance of the Love-Fests, for as they were no Parts of Religious Worship, but either going before or immediately following the Eucharist, so it no where appears that they were ever instituted by the Apostles at all, much less imposed as terms of Communion ; and though some Learned Men think the Apostles recommended them to the Churches, yet I see nothing in Scripture to ground such an Opinion upon, but rather on the contrary ; for *1 Cor. 11. 20, 21.* the Apostle does not only reprove them for their Disorders in those Feasts, but seems to disapprove of the very thing it self, and advises them rather to Eat their Meat at their own Houses, than to make those Solemn Assemblies, Places and Times of such Feasting : And the Learned Dr. *Lightsfoot* seems to have a great deal of reason for what he says upon this place, *viz.* That the Jewish part of the Church retained something of the Old Leaven, and could not forbear Judaizing in this Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and therefore it must be attended with a Feast, as the Passover was : And he observes, that the Apostle does not only find fault with their abuse herein, but with these very Feasts

themselves,

themselves, in that they dishonoured the Church by bringing their Meat into it, which they should rather have eaten at their own Homes.

And as ridiculous it is to say that the holy Kiss was imposed by the Apostles as a term of Communion, it was indeed the manner of Friendly Salutation, a meer Civil Rite used amongst Jews and Gentiles as well as Christians, and the Apostles Command relates only to the sincere, chaste and honest use of it, as became Persons devoted to God, and that they should not suffer that Token of Respect to degenerate into an Hypocritical or Lascivious Complement.

It is so far from being plain that these things were imposed as terms of Communion by the Apostles, That it is certain from their own words, They determined to lay no burthen upon Christians but necessary things, that is, things that had some good tendency; for that is the softest fence that the word Necessary will bear, and our English Ceremonies, by the Acknowledgment of all can never come under that Denomination.

And indeed if the Apostles had made these things terms of Communion in the Catholick Church, they must have remained so to this day, unless by some latter Apostolical Edict repealed, for who will dare to alter the Apostolical terms of Communion; and it may be, this Gentleman's design is to revive these old Ceremonies of Feasting, and Kissing and having all things common, not only for the sake of their Apostolical Institution; but, as being all of them Ceremonies of very comfortable importance to a Man of his Temper and Circumstances.

But after all, if it were plain that the Apostles made meer Ceremonies terms of Communion, it will scarcely follow, that our Bishops may do so too, no more than that they may write Canonical Epistles, and make Laws to bind the whole World as the inspired Apostles did; To make terms of Communion is a very great Power, especially if out of Communion there be no Salvation, for then to make terms of Communion, is to make the terms of Salvation, and to put such a Power into the hands of weak and fallible Men, is a thing of such dismal Consequences to the Souls of Men, that we may be sure our Blessed Redeemer would never do it: He has in his own Person, and by his Apostles whom he inspired, fixed that Law by which he will justify and condemn Men, and has not left it in the Power of any mortal to add thereunto, and to pretend to such Power, is not only to usurp upon Men, but upon God too; as if he must ask themselves, whether he shall have a Church upon Earth, or no.

---

REFLECTIONS  
 Upon a  
 PAMPHLET  
 ENTITLED,  
 A REVIEW  
 OF

*Mr. M. H's. new Notion of Schism, and the Vindication  
 of it.*

**T**HE Title of this Paper imports, that there has been some kind of Answer already made to the Enquiry and Vindication, but such as the Zealous Club judge lame and Impotent, and therefore have thought fit to order a Review; great things surely may be expected from this, which comes to supply the defects of the former.

Methinks the Author of the Reply, is more concerned in this thing called a Review, than either the Enquirer or Vindicator, for 'tis a scurvey intimation that his own Confederates do not believe him, when he boasts that he has run down his Adversary, and proved, and shewed, and demonstrated every thing, for if they had entertain'd as good an opinion of the success of his last expedition, as he himself has, it had been the most superfluous thing in the World to have come with a Review, before the other had received an Answer, these things would almost persuade a Man to think, that *T. W's* Reputation is not so great amongst the party as he pretends. Reply. 2. P. 35.

But whether this latter comes out on purpose to Affront the Citizen, or whether it be with his consent upon conviction of the miserable weaknesses of his Reply, I neither know nor care; my business is to enquire whether the valiant Second has done any greater feats, than he that first engaged in the quarrel.



This Gentleman must not expect an Answer, to his famous and innumerable *Oxford* Jest; I consider the humour of his party, and how dull and insipid every thing is to them how rational soever, that has not a great mixture of Farce and Comedy in it, for my part I shall take no more notice of them, than I would do of those little ludicrous wanton Creatures, that can make themselves excellent sport, with their own Tails and Shadows.

As to the Enquiry, there are two very material things he encounters in it, the Design and the Management. He will not allow the Design of it to be Honest and Peaceable, to allay heats, and create a better understanding amongst us, as the Vindicator pretends, that design it seems is too high, and the Vindicator ascribes too much to Mr. H. in saying, he endeavoured to create a better understanding betwixt parties that had been so long and learnedly contending, this is to place him in the Chair, and make him an Oracle, and I do not know what so uneasy a thing it is to Proud Men to hear any body commended but themselves; it seems the Reviewer had no design to accommodate differences, or to contribute any thing to a better understanding betwixt Church-men and Dissenters, he, modest man, will not pretend to take so high an aim, for my part, I believe this was not his design, but then I am sure it must be something worse, that is, to enflame the differences, and perplex the controversy, and no doubt he has managed such a design as well as he could.

He tells us Mr. H's design was no greater than to satisfy the scruples of some persons, and to make two Female Profelites, which is a great piece of news to Mr. H. for he declares he knows nothing of it, and desires the Gentleman to name the Persons that were to be drawn in; and to tell us at what Gossiping he pickt up this Story; or else we must lay the Brat at his own Door; I leave it to the Reader to judge what expectations Mr. H. could have from this Book, when he found so notorious a Fiction in the very first Page.

And truly he goes on as he began, telling us that Mr. H's Notion of  
 Review. p. 3. Schism will turn all Church Discipline out of Doors, for if breach of Communion be no Schism as these Gentlemen alledge, a Man may appeal from the Stool of Repentance to the Quakers Meeting House, &c. It is not without good reason that some Men have so great a spight at the Stool of Repentance, there are a sort of Men that hate it, as a Thief hates the Gallows, the Citizen could not forbear it in his Book; But to let that pass, I wonder where this Gentleman finds any such a Sentence in either of the books he pretends to review, as that breach of Communion is no Schism, let him produce it, or confess himself worse than a trifter; Both those Books acknowledge Separation of Communion to be Schism, if it be uncharitable, and to be sinful if it be without good reason, and how this can be prejudicial to Church Discipline I know not, unless by Church Discipline be meant that uncharitable, unchristian, and tyrannical thing, that has been sometimes acted under that

Title,

Title, and if that should be turned out of Doors by this account of Schism, all wise men will love it better upon that score.

He proceeds, We have reason to question the peaceableness of his design, *Review. p. 4.* for the Notion it self being contrived to encourage and justify Separation, I am afraid the last result and consequence of it will not be peace; this has as little honesty in it as the former, there is not the least tendency in Mr. H's Notion to encourage or justify any sinful Separation, nay it lays the strictest tie upon persons to see to it not only that the cause of their Separation be just, but the manner of it peaceable and charitable too; if the Cause be not just it is sinful, and if it be not managed peaceably and charitably it is Schismatical: Nay it obliges persons in the same Communion to avoid uncharitable contentions about the lesser matters of Religion, upon pain of being convicted of Schism by the Word of God, and how the effects of such an opinion should be any other than peace, I cannot unless it be by an Antiperistasis, and the powerful opposition of contrary principles that some Men have sucked in; I confess when these Gentlemen are so often telling us of the loss of peace, if Dissenters will not all come to Church, it appears to me like a menacing the Government, as if they were resolved to throw all into confusion again, unless they may be restored to the liberty of trampling us under foot, and if our present Indulgence be attended with such dangerous symptoms, I believe they do wholly arise from the discontents of some sour and haughty Spirits, that cannot be satisfied with all their Grandeur, whilst *Mordecai* sits in the Gate and will not bow.

But ( says he ) suppose a Man should introduce the same doctrine into the State, and tell people that it is lawful to act in separate Bodies, that they need not own the Present Government; but where has Mr. H. said any thing like this in the whole Enquiry? Does he any where say Men need not to own the Government that God has established in his Church, but may act by a Polity of their own? I wish this Gentleman can clear himself as well of such a Doctrine, as Mr. H. may; If he means that it is as unlawful to have several distinct Bishops and Churches in the same Diocese, as several Kings in the same Kingdom, he deserves the rebukes of the Government much more than Mr. H. or the Vindicator either; It is plainly the drift of these Men, to make themselves as absolute Governours over the Laity, as Princes over their Subjects, and if they can persuade Men, that it is as great a Crime to leave the Ministrations of their Parish Priest, what ever he be, and go to hear another, that is as truly a Minister of the Gospel, as to rebel against their Prince, and set up another in his room, they have taken a great step towards it.

His harangue about the Present Government, about the Title of *K. James*, the Nature and Rights of Sovereignty, he may if he pleases reserve for the Illumination of his Brethren, that are for distinguishing between Kings *de facto* and *de jure*, without which Vehicle they could not so easily have swallowed the Oath of Allegiance, or for his dear Friends in the Jacobite Conventicles,

cles; whom (it may be) he would willingly excuse from Schism, notwithstanding their Separation, because they still adhere to Episcopacy and Ceremonies, those fundamental Principles of Unity; that which follows in the same Paragraph, is equally false and impertinent, Mr. H. never sets people at liberty to break into parties or to make any such divisions as he speaks of, but endeavours to prevent all such things, by fixing a brand upon that division in affection, which commonly gives the rise to all other sinful divisions amongst men.

As to the differences betwixt the Presbyterian and the Independent Party in former times, with which he upbraids us, I shall only say, if the Presbyterian Churches were framed according to the Word of God, and laid no other Burden upon their Members than necessary things, according to the Apostles Canon, which all Churches are for ever bound to observe, that Separation was Sinful, and if it proceeded from uncharitableness it was Schismatical, according to Mr. H's. Notion; And if this Concession will do him any service, let him take it and make his best advantage of it: And if it be sinful to break off from Particular Church Communion without just cause, it is much more so for men to deny and renounce Communion with all Christians and Churches that will not comply with needless inventions of their own.

We are now come to Mr. H's Description of Schism, viz. That it is an Uncharitable Distance, Division or Alienation of affection, amongst those who are called Christians, and agree in the Fundamentals of Religion, occasioned by their different apprehensions about little things.

The Gentleman first charges this Description of Schism with Novelty and Wildness, and then proceeds to draw out the consequences; But as to Novelty and Wildness, if it be the Scripture notion of Schism, it will sufficiently clear it self of such imputations; The question Mr. H. proposed, was not what the Fathers called Schism, but what the Spirit of God calls so in his Word, it was this which he undertook to answer, and if he has acquitted himself well in that, he is not concerned what this or that Father calls Schism: and this description is founded on the case of the *Corinthians*.

*They were called Christians*, and it was fit to put that into the definition for we are not enquiring into the Schisms of *Jews*, *Turks*, or *Pagans*.

*They agreed in the Fundamentals of Religion*, that is, in all that was absolutely necessary to Salvation, otherwise the Apostle would scarcely have given them the Title of Brethren and Saints, acknowledging the Grace of God in them.

*That there were contentions amongst them to the prejudice of Christian Love and Charity*, will not be denied, since the Apostle plainly reprimands them for it; And that these contentions were occasioned by different apprehensions, is equally certain, otherwise there would have been no room nor pretence for such contests.

*And that all this was about little things*, that is, comparatively little, on which Salvation does not necessarily depend, is sufficiently plain, from the  
good

good account that is given of these persons as to the main, notwithstanding these unhappy differences; These contentions thus circumstantiated the Apostle calls Schisms, and Mr. *H.* though a man might without danger or offence conclude, That an Uncharitable distance or alienation of affections amongst those that are called Christians, occasioned by their different apprehensions about little things is Schism, according to the Scripture notion and account of it.

But nothing will please those that have a mind to be quarrelsome, this must be bantered, for a wild, novel, and bungling description, the latest that ever was Coined; And yet if this Gentleman had perused the Homilies of the Church of *England*, before he subscribed to them, as in all Reason and Conscience he ought to have done, he would have found such an Agreement betwixt Mr. *H.*'s description of Schism, and the sense of his own Church as would have obliged him, for his own sake to have treated it with better language.

Let him consult the Homily against contention, *F. 9.* and there he will find that the Church of *England* places the Unity of the Church in Concord and Charity, and the Rents or Schisms of the Church in discord, contention bitter Emulation, &c.

" Oh how the Church is divided ! Oh how it is cut and mangl'd ! Oh  
 " how that Coat of Christ which was without Seam is all rent and torn ! Oh  
 " body Mystical of Christ, where is that holy Unity, out of which, whoso-  
 " ever is, he is not in Christ ! If one Member be pulled from another, where  
 " is the Body ? We cannot be joined to Christ our Head, except we be  
 " glued with Concord and Charity one to another, for he that is not of this  
 " Unity is not of the Church of Christ, which is a Congregation or Unity  
 " together, not a Division, *St. Paul* saith, that as long as Emulation, or Envy-  
 " ing, Contention and Factions, or Sects be amongst us, we be carnal and walk  
 " according to the Fleishly Man; And *St. James* saith, if ye have bitter emulati-  
 " on, or envying, or contention in your hearts, glory not of it, for where conten-  
 " tion is, there is unstedfastness, and all evil deeds, &c.

Nothing is more evident than that the thing declaimed against in this Homily is Schism, what else signifie the words cut and mangled, divided, rent and torn ? And as plain it is, that this rending and tearing, and cutting and mangling the Body of Christ, is done by contention, by the violation of concord and charity, without which we cannot be joined to the Head, nor one to another, it is true it mentions Factions and Sects, but there may be Factions amongst those of the same external Communion, and He speaks of contentious Sects. there are many Sects too in the Church of *Rome*, where the external Com-  
 munion is the same, and so there were formerly amongst the Jews, and at this day in the Church of *England*, some are Arminians, others Calvinists in points of Doctrine; But both the Title of the Homily, and the express words and general scope of it, make the Rents and Schism in the Coat of Christ to consist principally in the want of Concord and Charity, in Emulation, envying, and heart contentions; Which I hope will justify Mr. *H.* from the censure of having advanced a wild, and novel doctrine.

Now

Now let us examine the Consequences, which this Gentleman has drawn out of this Definition.

*First of all, From hence it will follow, that he that was never truly admitted into the Christian Church may be guilty of Schism, if he be called a Christian.* But before we can tell whether there be any absurdity in this, we must desire him to explain himself and tell us, what he means by a true admission into the Christian Church; If by admission he means Baptism, and by true admission, Baptism after the form and mode prescribed by his Church, I doubt not there are many may be justly called Christians that were never so admitted, and if he will take upon him to assert that none can be guilty of Schism, but who have been admitted according to their Canons, he will fairly acquit a great number of Dissenters from that crime, who though they have been Baptized, yet not altogether according to their Rubrick; As for Mr. H's Words, they are plain enough, Schism in the Scriptural Sense, is only the fault of professed Christians, and all professed Christians are visible Members of the Catholick Church.

2. *That Hereticks in fundamentals are no Schismatics, for Mr. H. supposes that where there is a Schism, both parties must agree in the Fundamentals of Religion.* Yes, he does suppose so, and very justly, for those that deny fundamental Truths are without the Christian Faith, without the Unity of the Church; and where there is no such Union, there can be no Schism which always supposes a previous Union; As Treason always supposes that a Man be a Subject of the King, and Member of the Common-wealth.

If a Man never received the Fundamentals of Christianity, he never was a Member of Christ's Body, and therefore never a capable subject of that Christian Love, and Brotherly kindness, the violation whereof is the thing in Scripture called Schism, if he has formerly professed the Faith, and afterwards renounced it, he has by so doing, dissolved that principal Fundamental Union with the Christian Church upon which Brotherly Love is built, and therefore after such Apostacy cannot be formally guilty of the breach of Christian Charity, because he is indeed no Christian and so no capable Subject of such Charity, and can no more properly be called a Schismatick, than a Stone or Tree can be called blind, or any other thing in which there is no capacity of Sight.

And if the Gentleman do not like this Notion, he may if he pleases write a Book to convince the Grand Signior, and the Great Mogul, and Cham of Tartary, that they are all Schismatics, as were their Fathers Jannes and Jambres the Egyptian Sorcerers before them.

But he adds *This is as much as to say the greater the fault, the lesser the crime.* By no means, for what if Hereticks be not Schismatics, are they therefore innocent Creatures? What if Traytors, Murderers, Adulterers be not Schismatics, are they therefore Saints? Heresie in Fundamentals is a greater crime than bare Schism, and the less is merged in the greater; And it seems very strange that the same Gentleman, who but a line or two before

See the Review. p. 8.



fore thinks it absurd to call those Schismatics, who were never truly admitted into the Church, should think it also absurd, not to call those Schismatics that either never embraced the Christian Faith, or have since renounced it.

3. The third inference is, *According to this Definition, Alienation of Affection is Schism, but Division or Alienation of Communion is not*: Here he ought to have told us, what he means by Division or Alienation of Communion; Communion with the same God, and the same Mediator, and in the same Essentials of Faith and Worship is necessary to the Being of Christianity, and an Alienation here is something worse than Schism, if he mean personal Communion in the Worship of God in the same place, and after the same Mode, 'tis impossible this should be undivided; if by Alienation of Communion he means withdrawing from that particular Church of which we have been members, and joyning with another, 'tis no more but what is allowed to all, upon the removal of their Habitations, and may be lawful on many other accounts, but if it be done without some good reason it is sinful, if it be done out of Uncharitableness towards the Church we leave, it is Schism; now if he would be as plain with us as we desire to be with him, there might be hopes of bringing the matter to some issue.

But the last Inference is most remarkable both for Phrase and Sence, and I would desire the Author to review it. "No one can charge another with Schism, except he be able to look into his Heart, it is impossible to know according to this Description, that People are Schismatics, if they profess themselves to be in Charity, except we should enquire into the Secrets of their Hearts, and on the contrary People may be the greatest Schismatics under the outward Profession of Charity, and yet no Body can accuse them with it."

But pray, why is this last Sentence said to be *on the contrary* to the former, it's impossible to know that People are Schismatics, if they profess themselves to be in Charity, and on the contrary People may be the greatest Schismatics under the outward Profession of Charity, and no Body can accuse them. Here's a marvellous contrariety betwixt these two Sentences, *mensibus illis erant, & erant in montibus illis*, I suppose by on the contrary he meant on the Tautology, at least he must give us leave to take it so.

But is there no way then to know mens Uncharitableness, but by looking into the Secrets of their Hearts? Did he never hear of a rule, by their Fruits ye shall know them? How often does this Gentleman accuse the Enquirer and Vindicator with Malice and Uncharitableness? If he had no evidence for this by overt acts, we know what to call him, but if he had sufficient ground for it, then his Inference is spoiled and proves like the former.

Only thus far we will allow him to argue, if Schism consist in such Uncharitableness, and Alienation of Affection, men ought to be very cautious how they call one another Schismatics, lest they should be guilty of that Sin themselves, whilst they are charging it upon others; and I suppose this is

not the least of our Authors Prejudices against Mr. *H*'s Notion; that it will not suffer men to be continually bawling, Schismatics, Schismatics, against all that are not of their own Perswasion; but I am sure all but Schismatics will like it the better, upon this account, that it would lay a restraint upon men, that they should not without very good grounds, fix such a brand upon their Neighbours, nor as heretofore hunt them out of Churches, Corporations, and out of the World too as far as in them lay, by the noisic clamours they have raised about this Word.

Our Surveyor proceeds to blame this Notion for want of clearness, and puts wonderful hard Questions. 1<sup>st</sup>. *Whether this uncharitable distance must be really amongst those that are Christians*; But this is the same thing over again, and has received its Answer, they must really be such as profess Christianity, but who are real Christians God knows, and if these men will forbear calling Dissenters Schismatics till that matter be fully cleared, the World would be much quieter.

2. *Qu. What does he mean by Fundamentals of Religion*? But what strange perverseness is this in those who so often tell us, we have all the Fundamentals of Religion in the Apostles Creed? He asks, *Whether Fundamentals of Salvation, or Fundamentals of Truth, and I answer they are Fundamental Truths necessary to Salvation*; he urges further, are they so to every man in his Private Capacity, or are they the Fundamentals of Church Communion? These are mighty pretty Distinctions, pray why should those things be Fundamentals of Church Communion, which are not necessary to the Salvation of particular Persons?

3. *Qu. What does he mean by little things? Whether all Manner of little things, or Ecclesiastical little things*? Had this Gentleman look't into the case of the *Corinthians*, he might have answered himself, they are such things as relate to the Affairs of the Church, which are comparatively small, that is, small in Comparison of the great things wherein they agreed, and of the great heats these things caused.

From these little quibbles, which do no Body harm but himself, he returns to his former Practice of falsifying Mr. *H*'s Words, for (says he) *Review, p. 7.* Mr. *H*. tells us, there is but one Scripture in the Old Testament relating to this Affair, *viz. Num. 11. 21.* But what if Mr. *H*. say no such thing? Why then, all his fine Observations upon it fall to the ground, and he must give us leave to observe that he is a very unfair and unjust Writer; all that Mr. *H*. says, is, The Old Testament will not help us so much in this Enquiry as the new, only mentioning that one Text, and that not as giving us a proper Notion of Schism, but only helping to rectifie some mistakes concerning it.

Now I'll be so Civil to this Gentleman, as to help him to take this matter aright, He ought to consider, what that Enquiry was which Mr. *H*. says the Old Testament will not be so helpful in as the New, it was not how many times the Church has been troubled with Schisms? it was not his design to  
write

write a History of all the Schisms that ever were in the Church, either since Christ, or before; then indeed, if he had said the Old Testament will not be so helpful to us, the Gentleman might have inferred that the Jewish Church was not infested with this Sin; but the Enquiry was, What is that thing which the Scripture calls Schism? And those Texts were to be principally discussed, that have the Word Schism found in them; and by considering the circumstances of those Cases and Actions, which are charged with Schism, he comes to determine the formal Nature of that Sin; and there may be a hundred Texts relating to the thing, which would not be in the least helpful to Mr. H. in this Enquiry, till he had first cleared that to be really the thing called Schism, which must be proved by comparing it, with that which in express terms is so called: This was Mr. H's Method, and I think a very proper and rational One; and therefore the Cases which this Gentleman mentions of *Aaron* and *Miriam*, of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, of *Korah*, *Dathan* and *Abiram*, were very justly omitted by Mr. H. for how bad soever those Practices were, they cannot be proved Schismatical till it be made to appear that they are of the same kind and quality with those which Scripture calls Schisms.

He is pleased to divert himself, with the instance of *Eldad* and *Medad*; Propheying in the Camp, which he says is foreign to the business. 1. *Because they were to bear the weight of the Government with Moses under God.* But was it not in Subordination to *Moses*? Was not he the chief Governour still? And are not the Presbyters allowed some share of Government with the Bishops? and does that make them incapable of being Schismatics? 2. *Their Propheying was for a sign.* Well, be it so, and would have less answered that end, if these two, had been with the rest of them in the Tabernacle. 3. *They were acted by a constraining impulse, which surely is not the Case of our Nonconformists;* No surely, nor of the Conformists neither, though they openly declare at their Ordination, that they are moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon them the Office of the Ministry; But what if *Eldad* and *Medad* prophesied by impulse, did not Mr. H. obviate that Objection by putting us in Mind, that the Spirit of the Prophets is Subject to the Prophets, 1 Cor. 14. 22. And though this Gentleman says, that Scripture is impertinently alledged, yet wiser men, as *Grotius* and others, give that sense of it, which makes it as pertinent as any thing can be, viz. The Spirits of the Prophets are so subject to the Prophets themselves, that they are not acted with that urging Violence as will not allow a Compliance with the Rules of Order; that is, they might if they had pleased notwithstanding the Spirits resting upon them, have come into the Tabernacle as the rest did.

Lastly, he adds, *all this was secular, and distinct from that which did more peculiarly belong to the Ecclesiastical Body.* But propheying was a sacred thing, and the Tabernacle a sacred place, and that People a sacred People; and if the business of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, was not too much secular to come within the Verge of Schism, I wonder this should be thought so

forreign; but indeed after all, he wholly mistakes Mr. H's design in this instance, which was not to shew what was Schism, but what was not so, viz. That all Separation or Irregularity in sacred Actions is not Schism; this is that mistake, which by this Text he endeavoured to rectifie, and whether it be not apposite enough for that purpose is left to the Judgment of the Considerate Reader.

Joh. 4. 20.

This Gentleman is so very desirous to cast upon Mr. H. the reproach of ignorance, that rather than fail, he will betray his own, and something else which is worse; Mr. H. said, the Jews were obliged to worship at one place, and immediately explains it concerning Sacrificing, which being the most famous and noted part of their worship, may well be called so by way of eminency, as it is several times used in the discourse betwixt our Saviour and the Samaritane Woman, and he adds, This Obligation is vacated by that Gospel that wills us to pray every where; from hence our Surveyor would infer, That Mr. H. thought the Jews were to pray no where but at Jerusalem, when his own eyes would have told him, that in the same Paragraph Mr. H. acknowledges the Jews had their Synagogues, which are rather the patterns of our Christian Assemblies than the Temple; The only doubt is, whether that Rule, 1 Tim. 2. 8. since it only mentions Prayer, was pertinently alledged as vacating that Obligation which confined the Jews to one Altar; It is certain, it has been so understood by as Learned men as ever writ upon Scripture; I hope Grotius will be *instar omnium* with this Gentleman, his words upon the place are, *Preces Deo bodie non minus grata sunt in quavis Ecclesia quàm in Templo Hierosol.* and he bids us compare this with, Joh. 4. 21. And Danaus, and Vorstius, and Beza are with him in it, all these and many more were so ignorant as to think that only one part of worship is here mentioned, yet it is a rule which relates to the whole, and takes away all pretences of the Holiness of Places.

Review, p. 13.

P. 11.

This Gentleman seems to deny, that the Jews were obliged, only to offer at one Altar, and tells us of an Altar at Mount Ebal, of Samuels Sacrificing at Mizpah, Zuph, &c. And Elisha at Mount Carmel, and says, the Jews had their Synagogues, and inferiour Altars, which were still in Communion with the Supream One; and yet afterwards, he tells us out of *Sigonius* that there were no Synagogues till the time of the Captivity, that they who wanted the Temple to pray and teach in might have some place like the Temple in which they might assemble to perform that sort of Duty, and confesses that the Jews were confined to that one Altar at Jerusalem, till that Obligation was taken away by our Saviour; now what can a man do, but wait with patience till this Cameleon has assumed some certain colour, and when he has told us which of those inconsistent opinions he will abide by, he may expect a reply.

It is certain there was an express Law confining the Jewish Sacrifices to the Sanctuary which God should chuse, Deut. 12. 13, 14. *Take heed to thy self that thou offer not thy burnt Offering in every place thou seest, but in the place*

place which the Lord thy God shall chuse in one of thy Tribes there shalt thou offer thy Burnt-offerings. Yea all that was Sacred to God, as their Tithes and Free-Will-Offerings, must not ordinarily be eaten in any other place, but that which God should chuse, and though God gave them leave in Case of great distance from the Sanctuary, to eat those things in their own Gates, yet all Devoted things that were to be Sacrificed (though the distance was never so great) must be brought to the appointed place. ¶

What then shall we say to the Cases mentioned, where Sacrifices were offered at other Altars? The Answer is plain, 1. All those Anomalous Offerings excepting the last, were made before the chosen place was fixed, and Temple built, and it should seem by the beginning of the 12. chap. of *Deut.* That this Law was not designed to oblige so strictly, till the place was fixed, and prepared for that purpose; But, 2. These were all extraordinary Cases, and are not to be urged in Bar of a standing Rule; we are not certain that those Sacrifices were offered by the Priests the Sons of *Aaron*, and yet the Law appropriated that work to them. God may dispense with his own Law, but it is a Law still, and binds men, though not God, and is to be strictly observed in all Cases, saving those wherein God himself by his Prerogative sets it aside.

That there were any constant Inferiour Altars, upon which the Jews were allowed to Sacrifice, is a Notion more Novel and Wild than any thing in the Enquiry; the meer Suspicion of such a design in the two Tribes and a half on the other side *Jordan*, filled the People with amazement; and they appeal to God, that they had not built that Altar, to offer thereon Burnt-Offering or Meat-Offering or Peace-Offerings, and till they had made this Protestation, the rest of the Tribes could not be satisfied; and that these Inferiour Altars were in Communion with the Supream, has as much of Sense in it as the other has of Truth; I despair of ever knowing what the meaning of this Word Communion is; if it may be predicated of things inanimate we shall never comprehend its boundless significancy. Josh. 22. 22, 23.

The Gentleman we see is something confounded in his account of the matter of Fact, let us enquire whether he be any thing more clear in his Mystical Reasonings from it.

He is taught by Mr. *Dodwel* to say, That the only way of Uniting the *sephallab* to God was by the Sacraments; But this is notoriously false, for the Sacraments were only the Symbols of that Union, which fundamentally consists, in their hearty Dedication of themselves to God; and whoever had so done were the peculiar People of God, whether ever they enjoyed Sacraments or no. Review, p. 10.

That none could be in Union with God, unless United to the High-Priest, is false too, for the Seed of *Abraham* were Gods People, before they had any High-Priest, or Common-Altar amongst them; the Sacraments were not only transacted by the High-Priests, Parents Circumcised their Children themselves for a long time at least, and the Passover might be celebrated without



a Priest; and all true Believers are United to God, whether they have a Bishop, or Baptism amongst them or no; and the Sacrament supposes mens Union to God, but does not effect it.

His Observations, from *John 4. 21.* must be examined before we pass them. 1. *There is something under the Gospel, that does correspond to that solemn Worship at Jerusalem:* How do you mean correspond Sir? Their's was Worshipping the true God according to his Word, and ours is, or should be so; if that be corresponding we grant it, but what it is to the purpose I cannot Divine; he adds, *The Worship at Jerusalem and the Spiritual Worship were the Type and Antitype one of another,* I am loth to quarrel with him about Words, but I think it is a very improper Expression; that their Priesthood and Sacrifices and Altar were Types of Christ, I find the Apostle to the *Hebrews* largely illustrating, but that they were Types of Gospel-Worship, is neither agreeable to the Language of Scripture, nor the Reformed Churches. He further says, *As all the Jews did Communicate at one Altar, in like manner must all Christians partake in the same Spiritual Sacrifices.* If by Sacrifices, he means that which Christ offered up to the Father, we assent to it as a great Truth, or if he means the same Sacraments and Prayers, we grant these must be specifically the same amongst all Christians.

2. We are informed, *That the design of the Jewish Anniversaries was to keep them in the same Communion, and the spiritual Worship is for the same End.* If by the same Communion, he means the same Truth and Divine Worship, it is granted, or if he means their Union to one High-Priest, it is true so far as the High Priest was a Type of Christ, the only remaining High Priest of the Church; the same may be said of his three other Observations, which are all safe, whilst by the High Priest and Altar we understand Jesus Christ.

But if he means ( as he must if he will serve himself of them ) that this High Priest and Altar typifie the Government of the Church by Bishops, it is a very foolish and dangerous Notion; and if it proves any thing, it will prove, that there ought to be one Prime Bishop, the Principle of Unity with whom all Inferiour Priests and Churches must be in Communion, as he speaks, otherwise the Type and Antitype do not correspond in the principal Point, which is a Center of Unity; if he says, every Bishop is such a Center, then the Donatists formerly and the Papists now are excused from Schism, for they have their Bishops as well as the Church of *England*, but I have largely proved from the acknowledgment of the most Learned Doctors of our own Nation, that Episcopacy is not Essential to the Unity of the Church, and I would send this Gentleman to them, who will teach him better Divinity, than the Mythology of Mr. *Dodwel*.

'Tis a gross mistake, to say, *That Salvation belonged only to those that worshipped at Jerusalem*, there were Proselytes, who only submitted to the Seven Precepts of *Noah*, and were not circumcised, nor admitted to the Priviledges of the Jewish Church, and yet to these the Jews granted a part in the

the World to come, such were *Naaman*, *Cornelius* and many more; this he might have found in *Selden*, *Lightfoot*, *Meade*, &c. and our Saviours words, Salvation is of the Jews, were never intended to exclude all others, for the same Jesus by his Apostle *Peter* tells us, God is no respecter of persons, but in every Nation he that feareth God, and worketh Righteousness, is accepted of him; But the Jews enjoyed the ordinary means of Salvation, and Christ the Saviour of the World was of them, according to the Flesh.

The Mystical reasonings of this Gentleman from the One High Priest and Altar amongst the Jews, are pure impertinencies as to the Question in Hand; For the Jews were obliged to have only One High Priest, and One Altar, and no more, or if they had (according to his fiction) it must be in dependence upon the Supreme One, but under the Gospel it is quite otherwise, for it is in the power of Christian Kingdoms, to multiply particular Churches, and distribute a greater Diocese or Parish into as many lesser as they see good, each having their proper Bishop, without any dependence one upon another, in point of Government, the Bishop of *Engubium* is as absolute in his Church as the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; The Diocese of *Chester* might, if the King and Parliament pleased, be divided into twenty or a hundred Bishopricks, without any Jurisdiction of one over the rest, but such a thing could not be done amongst the Jews, without confounding and destroying their Constitution.

He blames Mr. *H.* for laying so much stress upon the word Schism, and P. 14. tells him the Nature of Schism may be expressed by other words, as *ἑκδομή*, *ἑκδομή*, *ἑκδομή*, and *ἑκδομή*. Mr. *H.* never denies but it may, and so may the Nature of Treason be expressed by other terms, but yet he that would prove any thing to be Treason by Statute Law, must see whether he finds it so called in the Statute, 25 *Edward III.* or any other that ascertain Treason; And so he that would prove *ἑκδομή*, &c. to be Schism, must enquire, how far the practices by these words signified, are of the same nature with those which are expressly called Schism in the Statutes of Christ.

He pretends to give us a more exact interpretation of the words, *ἑκδομή* and *ἑκδομή*, and what is it? Why they signify a Separation of the parts, a rending or cleaving of one thing into two; no great Criticism! All the World knows where there is a Separation there must be parts Separated, but says he, in the Ecclesiastical sense, it must signify a dividing of Christs Body, which is most visibly done by Separation and Breach of Communion; No doubt Schism signifies division, and a breach of the Unity of the Church; But that Unity does not consist in the Unity of one Governing Head under Christ, nor in the Unity of one Personal Communion, which is impossible, but in the Unity of Faith and Love; If by Separation of Communion he means multiplying particular Churches, this is very lawful in many cases, an overgrown Church may be divided into ten or twenty, and if it be done upon good reason, and with Christian Love and Charity, there is nothing at all either Sinful or Schismatical in it; if there be any Schism in forming new particu-  
lar

lar Churches which are found in the Faith, it must be in doing it contentiously and out of opposition to one another, which resolves it into Mr. H's Notion of Uncharitableness.

Mr. H. observes that the word *ἡσυχία* is used figuratively, for a division, and that twofold. 1. A Division in Apprehension, for which he cites *John 7. 43.* To this the Gentleman Replies, *There was not only a diversity of Opinion, but dividing into Parties*; be it so, still this was occasioned by their different apprehensions to which the Word plainly refers, some said, This is the Christ, others said, Shall Christ come out of *Galilee*, so there was a division among the People about him, the connexion leaves no room to doubt, but that this division relates principally to their apprehensions; He says they were divided into Parties, so all men are in their differences of apprehension, some think so, others thus, but I hope he will not call that a separation of Communion, for then it will be hard to know where to find one Communion; We know the Clergy of the Church of *England*, are of several parties amongst themselves, (in this sence of the word) about another great Person in the World; but (he adds) *They censured and reviled one another*, they did so, and this was the effect of that division in their thoughts of Christ, like to many at this day, that shew very little either of Charity or Common Civility, towards those whose apprehensions are different from their own.

As to the other Text, *John 9. 16.* the very reading of the words will satisfy any Man what is meant by that division, *Some of the Pharisees said, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day; others said, How can a Man that is a Sinner do such Miracles? And there was a Division among them.* That great quarrels did ensue Mr. H. never denied; the same may be said concerning the other texts.

Mr. H. says, This diversity of opinion, judgment or apprehension cannot be lookt upon as in it self Criminal; The Surveyor most disingenuously perverts these words, as if Mr. H. meant, *It was no matter what opinion Men had of Christ or his Apostles, no matter whether they took him for the Messiah or a Mad-man*; Whereas in the very next words he says, where the matter is weighty and reacheth the fundamentals there an Error is Criminal; This was plain enough to convince our Author, or any Man in the World, that Mr. H. was far from intending to Libel Christ, or to make an Apology for the Jews and Sadduces in their reviling of him; If this Gentleman had not told us, I could never have guessed how it could enter into his head to fix such an odious sence upon Mr. H's words, but it seems, that which led him to it was, Mr. H. said, *This diversity of apprehension*, and why did he prefix the relative this, if not referring to the Antecedent Texts? I'll tell him, and it is a shame he should need to be told, Mr. H. but a few lines before distinguished of division in apprehension, and division in affection; and shewed that sometimes *ἡσυχία*, is used for division in apprehension, and then adds this diversity of opinion, judgment, &c. that is, this first species or kind of division, according to the distinction newly laid down; There you have

have the antecedent to which the relative *this* refers. *This* division, in apprehension is not always criminal, but the other division, viz. in affection, is always so; That this is the true Thred and Sence of his Discourse, I appeal to any Man of Common Sence and Honesty; It is not therefore Mr. H. that knows not what he says, but 'tis the Surveyor that cares not what he says, so he may but render Mr. H. contemptible to the unthinking Debauchees, the noble Patrons of his present adventures.

The Enquirer justly declaims against that mischievous practice of making our own opinions ( like *Procrustes's* Bed, ) the Standard by which to measure all others; To which the Gentleman replies, *But if Authority think fit to call Mr. H. to the Standard, he is undoubtedly a Subject, and I know not why he should not go as well as I.* This is really a very fair confession, that though he will not yield to a private person, in differences about Religion, yet he can be of any length, of any opinion which Authority shall set up for a Standard and call him to, A Man of a malleable, ductile, compliant Conscience, that can stretch or contract himself to the Standard that Authority sets up in matters of Religion, for he is a Subject, and must go to it; herein the Dissenters differ from him, and cannot lay aside their present apprehensions in matters of Religion, either upon the call of private persons or of Authority it self, until the louder voice of Reason oblige them to it; And yet through the Mercy of God, Authority has taken down the Standard now, not delighting either to cramp, or rack the Consciences of Men in matters of Religion.

It seems the Enquirer and Vindicator have frighten'd this Gentleman into his Devotions, and set him a Praying ( I suppose without the Book, for *vexatio dat intellectum* ) that he may never stand in need of their Charity, and I believe they have as much Reason to pray that they may never stand in need of this Mans Justice, for when the Vindicator was making his Apology to any that might think he had treated *T.W.* somewhat more roughly than such a Man could well bear, this Gentleman tells us several times, the Vindicator boasted of his rude and malicious usage of the Citizen, let this Man learn to be Just before he pretend to be Charitable; As for the Vindicators usage of *T.W.* let it be referred to all the Sober Church-men in *Cheshire*, where the Man is known, as well as the manner of his Writing, I am sure some of his own Communion openly said, he was treated in that answer, with but too much respect.

But why should this Author be so terrified with the Thoughts of ever standing in need of the Dissenters Charity; Is he afraid of the *Lex talionis*? There can be no danger of that, unless Authority should ever be on their side, and set up its Standard for them, and if it should do so, this Gentleman has declared he is a Subject, and must go to it, for how ill so ever he may like the Principles of Nonconformity, while they are but the Sentiments of private Persons, yet if Authority should set them up for a Standard, they are  
 ○  
 become

become quite another thing, he can go to it, as well as we, and be on the right side still; If this be not fairly collected out of his own words, I know no tolerable meaning they are capable of.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> Page he delivers himself of a Notion which I believe is really his own, *i. e.* That it is as possible for all men to agree about the lesser matters of Religion as about its great and fundamental Articles; An assertion contrary to all reason, and the experience of Mankind; All Protestants acknowledge, that the Essentials of our Religion, are clearly revealed in Scripture, and in these they generally agree, but no one ever pretended the same of all circumstances, which are usually proved or disproved by inferences from Scripture, and sometimes remote ones too, wherein it is common for Disputants to disagree, and easie to be mistaken; whereas the Fundamentals being more directly and positively asserted in the Word of God, admit of clearer demonstration.

'Tis true indeed those that think it their duty in all the lesser matters of Religion to follow their Leaders, and that make their Commands in these things the Standard of Sin and Duty, have found out an easie Rule of Controversie, and this seems to be his opinion, for he says, if Mr. H. were better acquainted with Church History he would find, that whole Churches and Nations had their peculiar Customs and Ceremonies, and yet their Members agreed well enough in their opinions about them; And I will venture to add if this Gentleman be as well acquainted with Church History as he pretends, he knows in his Conscience, that he imposes upon his Reader, and would obtrude a great fallacy upon the World.

The first Attempt for the introducing such Customs and Ceremonies into the Worship of God, occasioned a great deal of Contention and Discord in the Apostles times; and the Imposers were severely check'd by them for their Arrogance, and all Christians commanded to stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and not suffer themselves to be entangled with the yoke of Bondage, and so great a Disturbance was raised by urging such Ceremonies, that the Apostle wishes they were cut off that troubled the Church with them.

And after the Apostles were dead, when Ceremonies began to encrease, (though they were not for some time enjoined, but the People took them up partly of their own accord, partly upon the example of those they had a great Veneration for) yet they occasioned great Animosities and Discord in the Churches, of which *Socratus* gives us many instances, *Lib. 5. c. 21, 22. Sozom. l. 7. 19.*

And when *Victor* would needs impose his Observation of *Easter*, such Feuds and Heats were raised thereby, as made them the scorn of the Pagans, and were greatly lamented by all sober Bishops and Christians, and both *Cyprian* and *Irenaeus* greatly blame him [τῆς ἀκαταστάσεως] as stretching the Rigour of his Government, not only beyond his line, but also to Causes of indifferency, which would not admit of such severe Censures. And

*Gal. 5. 1.*

*9. 12.*

*Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.*



as Ceremonies and Impositions encreased, Contentions grew up with them, till at last a great part of the Christian World was laid in a dead sleep, with that Poison poured into the Church, and for a long time became like *Iffachar*, a strong Ass, submitting to every Burthen; then indeed there was almost a Universal Agreement about Ceremonies, and a general Prostitution of Conscience to the dictates of the pretended Catholick Church, but that was the darkest and worst state, wherein Christianity ever was in the World.

I come now to examine this Gentleman's Account of the *Corinthian* Schism, and indeed [*hic pes figendus*] this is the Core of the Controversie and the hinge upon which it turns, if he be right in this he has broken Mr. *H*'s Measures, and put him upon a new Enquiry.

Mr. *H*. supposes that these *Corinthians* who are reproved for their Schismatical Contentions, were agreed in the fundamental Articles of Faith, and great Truths of the Gospel, but engaged in foolish and uncharitable Contests about the Apostles, some commending *Paul*, and preferring him before the rest; others crying up *Cephas*, and a third sort *Apollos*; thus having the Faith of Christ with respect of Persons.

This Gentleman has learned from Dr. *Hammond* to say, [*That the Persons reproved for these Contentions, were the Gnostick Hereticks, that denied the Resurrection of the Dead, and lived in Incest, and dissuaded the People from Marriage, and sacrificed to Idols that they might escape Persecution, some of them pretend they had their heretical Doctrines from St. Paul, others fastened theirs upon Apollos, others upon Cephas, and another sort pretended they had seen Christ himself, and received those Doctrines from his Mouth; And (he affirms) they were Heretical Gnosticks only, and not the Orthodox, who are reprehended by the Apostle for saying, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos; and concludes, that the Schism of the Corinthians lay in opposing the sound Orthodox Doctors, and maintaining their own wild Heresies under the Umbrage of these great Names.* Review p. 20. P. 22. P. 24.]

Were it not for these Gnostick Hereticks, I know not what some Men could do to misunderstand plain Scripture; if we meet with any smart Reproofs in the Apostolical Epistles, still they must be levell'd at the Gnostick Hereticks; if any were guilty of Fornication, it was the Gnosticks, if any of Temporizing, or of Schism, they were Gnosticks; as if all besides them had been Pure and Innocent. This is too great partiality, and favours much of the Pharisaical Humour of some Modern Men that are for casting the Odium of every ill thing upon those they are pleased to call Schismatics; that under this Blind, all the Sons of the Church may come off clear, and be thought in every thing blameless and inoffensive.

Now although I make no question but there were such Hereticks in those days, and that they were as bad as he describes them, that some of them lived amongst the *Corinthians*, and that the Apostle sometimes speaks concerning them, (though I seldom find that he speaks directly to them) yet

that these were the persons here reproved for Schism (much less the only persons) I can never believe: For these reasons,

1 Cor. 1.

1. The Character which the Apostle gives of these contentious *Corinthians*, in the context will by no means fit the Gnostick Hereticks, for we find he calls them the Church of God, Saints, and in the 9th verse, Persons that were called into the Fellowship of Christ Jesus our Lord, and in the very same verses wherein he admonishes them of their Schismatical Contentions, he calls them Brethren, v. 10. Now I beseech you, Brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions amongst you, — For it hath been declared unto me, of you my Brethren, that there are contentions among you; Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of *Paul*, &c. Can any Man imagine these such gross and damned Hereticks, as the *Gnosticks* have been always described? Can we believe, the same Apostle that was so sharp upon those that urged the Jewish Ceremonies, as to call them Dogs, and Evil Workers, and bid the Christians beware of them, would be so tender and kind, so affectionate and endearing to the vilest corrupters of the Christian Faith, as to call them Saints and Brethren, and all the good names imaginable; I am sure the Church of *England* seldom speaks to Protestant Dissenters in such obliging language, and yet I hope we are not altogether so bad as the *Gnostick* Hereticks.

1 Sam. 2. 3.

2. If the fault here reproved had been Heresie, and such as this Gentleman speaks of, there's no question but the Apostle would plainly and expressly have mentioned it; We never find him guilty of sparing such Sins and Sinners as these; And if he had now to do with those that taught damnable Heresies under that horrid aggravation of fathering them upon himself, and upon Christ too, which would have added Blasphemy to his Heresie, it would have been a great deal too soft and tender, onely to have said, it has been declared unto me of you my Brethren, that there are contentions amongst you, such kind of reproof would have born no proportion to the crime, but would have been next door to a justifying of them, and so far from convincing them of the desperate guilt they were under, that it would rather have betray'd them into a good opinion of themselves and their Doctrines; It is generally observed that *Eli* greatly sinned in reproofing such flagitious offences of his Sons in that mild language, Why do you such things? For I hear of your evil dealings by all this People, nay, my Sons, for it is no good report that I hear of you, for you make the Lords People to Transgress, &c. and yet this is much more plain and home than the Words of *Paul*, if he was reproofing a crime of that Nature.

And as we have all the reason in the World to think he would have been severer in the case, so he would doubtless have spoken directly to the matter, he would have exposed and disowned their Errors, and acquitted himself before all the World, he would have called them Hereticks, and set a black mark upon their Heresies, and instead of saying, was *Paul* Crucified for

for you, or were ye Baptized in the Name of *Paul*, would have challenged them, did *Paul* ever tell you, that there was no Resurrection, did *Paul* ever give you leave to live in Incest, or to Sacrifice to Idols? And he would have taken that occasion, since a fairer could never offer it self, immediately to disapprove and damn those Errors, which they had broach'd under his Name and Authority, but there being not one word to this purpose, but a deep silence in all the Context; He must be able to swallow a Camel, that can digest such a Notion.

3. Had this been the case, the Apostle would certainly have made a manifest distinction betwixt the Orthodox and the Hereticks, and have plainly advised the Orthodox, how to proceed against those Blasphemous wretches; But here is no such distinction made, but the fault of contention charged upon them all, Now this I say, *that every one of you saith, I am of Paul*, which according to this Gentlemans Comment must be, Now this I say, that every one of you is turned Heretick, and Father your Heresies upon me, and upon Christ too; I will not be so nice upon the word *use*, as to say there were none free, but doubtless it must argue a very common faultiness, and they were so generally engaged in these foolish contests, that he could not have an Account thereof from the Church in Common, for Men do not love to inform of themselves, but the House of *Closet* sent him the bad news; now can we think the Apostle would in such general terms have assaulted the Heresies of some particular Persons? Would he have laid such a Temptation before all succeeding Ages, to condemn the whole Church of *Corinth* for *Gnosticks*; Certainly his Love to that People, and indeed Justice it self would have obliged him, in such a case, to have distinguished betwixt the Innocent and the Guilty.

And it is as reasonable to conclude, that the Apostle would have commanded the Orthodox to admonish and reject such abominable Wretches from their Communion, we see in the case of the incestuous person he did so, and certainly he would not have been more favourable to these, who according to this Gentlemans account, were no better, but rather worse than he, and indeed as bad as can be imagined.

4. The Advice that the Apostle gives to these contending Corinthians, shews that he did not speak to *Gnostick Hereticks*, he counsels them to be of one mind, and to speak the same thing, and to be perfectly joined together in one mind, and in one Judgment, and that there be no divisions among them; Our Gentleman thinks this will prove that they were Hereticks, and I think it is demonstration on the other side; For let it be observed the same persons that he reproves for saying, *I am of Paul*, and *I of Apollis*, &c. in the 12. v. and of whose contentions ( he says ) he had heard in the 11. v. he advises in the 10. v. to be of one mind, and to be perfectly joined together; Now if all these he here speaks to were Hereticks, would the Apostle have commanded them to be all of one Mind, and to be perfectly joined together, was the Apostles design to reconcile one Heretick to another, the  
Heretick

Heretick that was of *Paul* to the Heretick that was of *Apollos*; was he troubled that the Hereticks did no better understand one another? And is this the meaning of that kind and obliging Admonition? Dear Hereticks, agree amongst your selves, and let there be no Divisions amongst you? Would not this have been an encouraging and strengthening them in their Confederacy against Christ, his Gospel and Church? It would be a very suspicious thing, for one that pretends to be a Loyal Subject, to go to a herd of Rebels that are quarrelling one with another, and perswade them to keep together, and to avoid Division, and to be of the same Mind, it would be a better Office to sow the Seeds of Contention amongst them, to break their Confederacy, that they might be more easily subdued.

For the Contention on their side would have been commendable.

And it is not to be omitted, how cunningly this Gentleman alters the Phrase, and *being perfectly joyned together*, he expounds, be well joynted and compacted in the Church; but here's no colour for such a Paraphrase, and to bid Hereticks be joyned one to another, is rather forbidding them being joyned to the Church; no doubt he would have commanded them to abandon their Devilish Errours, and return to the Truth, and would have charged the Orthodox to oppose them, and to Contend earnestly for the Faith delivered to them, and not to incorporate with them till they had renounced their Errors; but to bid these Hereticks be of one Mind, and of one Judgment, when there lay an indispensable Necessity on them all to change their Minds, is such odd, insipid, and insatuated Counsel, as cannot without a degree of blasphemy be ascribed to an inspired Apostle.

5. The Repetition of this matter in the third Chapter, affords us further Evidence, that this Gentlemans Notion is false, 'tis true the Apostle upbraids them there with the weakness of their Faith and Judgment, that they were but as Babes in Christ, and yet that would be a strange Character of the Gnosticks, far different from that which this Author gives us; but the Apostle proceeds to reprove them for Envyng and Strife, and Division, in saying, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, &c.* And adds, *Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but Ministers by whom ye believed, I have planted, Apollos hath watered, and God gave the increase?* What fence can any man put upon this, but that the fault here censured, lay in their glorying too much in Instruments, some in one, some in another, and therefore he adds, *Let no man glory in man, for all things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, all are yours, and ye are Christs, and Christ is Gods.* Would all this have been true of the Gnostick Hereticks, or would this have been a proper way of dealing with them for their recovery?

P. 110.

6. *Clemens Romanus*, in the passage this Gentleman cited would have undeceiv'd him, if it had been considered, *Ἀναλίστη τῷ ἑταίρῳ τῷ μαρτυρῶν Παύλῳ, &c.* Take into your hands the Epistle of the blessed Apostle *Paul* which he wrote unto you in the beginning of his Gospel, for he being divinely inspired, admonished you, that there were sidings and factions amongst you, concerning Himself, and *Cephas*, and *Apollos*; But there was less Sin



in that siding *than in your present Contentions*, for there you sided with the Apostles, &c.

Now I would fain know, were these *Corinthians* Gnosticks too, to whom *Clemens* here writes? If the other were, these must be so too, for he says the Apostle admonished you, that there were sidings among you.

*Clemens* here tells us, that the Contending *Corinthians*, whom *St. Paul* reprov'd, sided with the Apostles, which he mentions as a thing which did extenuate their Crime; did the Gnostick Hereticks do so? Can we think that by siding with the Apostles, he means fathering their damnable Heresies upon the Apostles, surely that would rather have aggravated than lessened the fault; this Gentleman tells us, the Gnostick Hereticks here reprov'd opposed their Orthodox Governours, which agrees but very forrily, with what *Clemens* says of the *Corinthian* Schismatics siding with the Apostles.

That Schism which *Clemens* reprehends, he says was worse than that censured by the Apostle *Paul*, *ἢ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν οὗν ἀποστόλων*, in the former Schism they sinned less than in the latter; but what could be worse than the Gnostick Heresie, and fathering it upon God himself? If those to whom *Clemens* writes were worse than the Gnosticks, 'tis strange we should not hear him taxing them, with monstrous Errors, and horrid Crimes, but that on the contrary he should tell them, they had one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit poured out upon them, and one calling in Christ, and he aggravates their Sin in casting off their Faithful Elders, because it was done by the Godly, and says, *It was without President, that the just should be rejected by Godly Men*; and nothing is more evident by the whole Series of that Epistle, than that the Schism there reprov'd, was not any Heresie or Apostacy from the Faith, but that for the sake of a few factious Persons, they had slighted and cast off their faithful Presbyters, by whom, not by any one single Person, that Church was governed, and the great fault is laid upon the want of Charity, *ἀγάπην ἡρώμα οὐκ ἔχον*, his great Encomiums upon Charity, and his earnest pressing of them to it, shews that he look'd upon Uncharitableness to be the very Soul of their Schism, whereby it was informed and acted, which agrees so well with *Mr. H's* account, that this Gentleman should have called it any thing rather than new; but if this was the latter *Corinthian* Schism, and if the former was not so criminal as this, surely it could not be, that damnable Blasphemous Gnostick Heresie which this Gentleman speaks of.

7. If I thought, what has been said were not sufficient, I could add that the account, which *Jerom* and many after him give of this *Corinthian* Schism will by no means quadrate with the Gnostick Heresie, the Passage is very Trite and Common. "*Antequam Diaboli instinctu studia in Religione fierent, & diceretur in Populis, Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cepha, communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesia gubernabantur, postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi, toto orbe decretum est ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesie cura pertineret, & Schismatum semina tollerentur.*" Now though I can

by



by no means grant that upon this very Schism Episcopacy was instituted for the Reasons already given, yet it is sufficient for the present purpose, that it was upon a Schism of the same kind, and therefore the Nature of Schism may be understood hereby, it consisted in contending about their Ministers that governed them in Common, and instead of paying a due and equal respect to them all, some cried up this, another that, probably every one would magnifie him, by whom he had been Converted and Baptized, and at length it seems it infected the Ministers themselves, and they begun to challenge a special Propriety, in those they had Baptized, as if by Baptism men had been united to them, not to Christ, for the Prevention whereof one was chosen from amongst the rest, and the Government of the whole principally committed to him, and by this means, they endeavoured to prevent such contests about the Preheminence for the future.

Let the Gentleman apply this to the Gnostick Heresie, and he will find it to be the most unapt and discordant thing in the World, were those Hereticks under the Common Government of the Presbyters of *Corinth*? No, he says they opposed their Orthodox Governours, and puts the grossest abuse upon the Apostles, making them Hæresiarcha's; and what would it have signified to such men as those to have one of their despised Presbyters made a Bishop? How would this have put an end to the Heresie? What tendency could it have to make them change their Minds, and renounce those Opinions for which they pretended Apostolical Authority? Would they think that as soon as the Presbyter was advanced to the Quality of a Bishop, he presently commenc'd infallible, and therefore they must necessarily speak and think as he dictated to them? The World has not found Episcopacy to be such a Sovereign Cure of Heresie, the Arians had their Bishops, and so have the Papists, and prodigious great ones too, but they are generally the greatest promoters of Heresie of all others.

I would now willingly consider any thing that has the least colour of reason to prove, that the *Corinthian* Schism was the Gnostick Heresie, and I have searched as diligently as I could those three or four pages which the Gentleman has writ upon this Point, but I must needs say his whole discourse upon it is the most confus'd Jargon, that ever I read from a man pretending so high as he does.

The thing which he insists most upon, to overthrow Mr. H's Notion, that the *Corinthian* Schism lay in Uncharitable Contentions about their Ministers, is that Expression, *And I of Christ*, upon which he thus Harangues, *Our Saviour was ascended up into Heaven long before this, and it would have been a strange wild Fancy, not to be contented with any other Minister excepting him — besides it would be hard to assign any Reason, why any Body should prefer Paul or Apollos before Christ. I always thought our Saviour might have had the Pre-eminence.*

*Christ. in  
loc.*

But these Questions have been often put, and variously answered; some think the Apostle speaks this of himself, as if he should say, Let others chuse who

who they will for Heads of their Parties, I only chuse Christ for mine ; others say that some few of the *Corinthians* being wiser than the rest, contented themselves with the Name of Christians, without any other dividing Denomination. *Partus in loc.*

But that which seems most probable is, that these unhappy Contentions about *Paul* and *Apollos* had this effect upon some, that they too much slighted them all, and pretended to be of Christ, in contempt of his Ministers, and it is observable, that our Old Bibles Printed with large Notes in Queen *Elizabeth's* days, and by her Authority, give this last as the sense of the place, which shews that it was agreeable to the Sentiments of the Bishops in those days, otherwise they would not have permitted those Notes to have been gone along with it, and we have also there this account of Schism, that it is when men who otherwise agree in Doctrine, separate themselves from one another ; Now let this Gentleman take any of these Solutions, and it will be abundantly less absurd than this account of the matter which he has given us.

He tells us, That because these *Corinthians* had not the writings of the New Testament, but must be instructed by their Prophets and Evangelists, it would be a difficult thing for them to judge betwixt the Orthodox and the Heretical ; but I cannot apprehend any such mighty difficulty in the Case ; the Apostles when ever they planted Churches, preached unto them the fundamental Articles of the Gospel, which are few and plain, and therefore easily received and remembered ; those that believed upon their Preaching could not so quickly forget them, nor could they be easily perswaded to think that the Apostles would preach one Doctrine to them, and the contrary to others, and we may be assured, any that should come with such wicked pretensions would meet with a sharp repulse ; and it was so far from being a difficult thing to discover such impostures, that nothing but folly or fascination could hinder them from so doing, and therefore when the *Galatians* were corrupted with the Principles of Judaical Pretenders, the Apostle admires at their weakness, *O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, &c.*

He further informs us, " That when there were contrary Doctrines preached, the proof of each must depend upon the Credit and Authority of those Persons from whom they were derived ; if from Christ it was the greatest, if from the Apostles it was next, if from one of the first Converts, as *Apollos*, it was the last great Authority. I must confess, this is quite above my reach, I know not, why this Gentleman should fancy such degrees of Credit and Authority as these. The Apostles and Evangelists who were at that day infallibly inspired, spoke with the highest Authority even that of Christ himself, who spoke by them and in them by his Spirit, and to distinguish betwixt the Credit and Authority of what Christ spoke and of what the Apostles Preached and writ, is not only a vain but a dangerous thing, and makes such a difference in the several parts of Scripture as ought not to be made, as if there was less Credit and Authority in some than others,

I suppose, the proof of any Doctrine would depend upon this Point rather, whether it was really the Doctrine of Christ, and his inspired Apostles and Evangelists or no, if it could be evinced that any of them had delivered it, there was proof sufficient of its Truth and Authority in the highest degree; The Authority of the Apostles was not questioned, nor any such degrees of Credibility imagined betwixt the Doctrine of Christ, and the Apostles and inspired Evangelists, as to leave room for such pretended Comparisons, all the doubt was, whether such a Doctrine was theirs or no, and there could not want Witnesses in every Church to confront any one that should bring another Gospel under any Name whatsoever.

The Gentleman has discovered a wonderful Argument for his Opinion in the form of Salutation the Apostle uses in this Chapter, *1 Cor. I. 2.* *"To all that in every place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours, from whence (says he) it is plain, the Apostle makes two Parties amongst them, the Orthodox and the Hereticks, theirs and ours."*

This then must be the meaning of that Preface, The Church of God which is at Corinth, Sanctified in Christ Jesus, and whose members are called to be Saints, consists of two Parties. 1. Theirs, that is to say, notorious damn'd Gnostick Hereticks, that deny the Resurrection, and hold it lawful to live in Incest, and to Sacrifice to Idols, and that blasphemously ascribe these Doctrines of Devils to Christ and his Apostles; these are the first sort of the Holy, Sanctified Members of the Church of God at Corinth. 2. Ours, That is, the Orthodox that hold fast the Truth, and the form of sound words; Grace and Peace be to them both; certainly this would be the most scandalous Paraphrase, that ever was invented, and yet the Gentleman sees this plainly in the Text.

But alas it affords no pretence for such a Comment, for *theirs and ours*, plainly refer to the Lord Jesus, who (says the Apostle) is both their Lord and ours, Theirs, that believe on him as well as Ours, that preach him to the World, or theirs, that are Gentiles, as well as Ours, that are Jews, the Common Lord of all the faithful, all the World over, thus it is understood, by the whole band of Interpreters, Dr. Hammond himself not Dissenting, but when a mans fancy is deeply ting'd with a Notion, every thing must be thought to support it, or else, this would never have been mentioned to such a purpose.

I now attend his Review of the second instance of Schism, *1 Cor. II. 20.* I hear that there be Divisions among you, &c. Mr. H. observes this could not be meant of breach of Communion, because they all come together into one place and into the Church too; The Gentleman replies, there was a notorious breach of Communion even at the Communion Table, and very great and scandalous Miscarriages; and who ever doubted of that? But does he call these things a breach of Communion? Then I am afraid it is often broken among themselves; when Mr. H. denies, that there was any breach of Communion, he takes it in their own Sense, there were no separate Meetings, other-

otherwise where-ever there is a Violation of Love and Charity amongst Christians there is a breach of Communion, and his whole Book tends to prove it.

Will this Gentleman say, that by these divisions are meant, the rude and disorderly behaviour of some amongst them, or rather the contests that those miscarriages caused ; If he speaks sence he must say the latter ; For it is not usual, to call the miscarriages of one sort divisions ; Besides these miscarriages, tho' very great, were chiefly about the Love Feasts which accompanied the Sacrament, as the Gentleman himself acknowledges, and therefore were not altogether so destructive of Communion, as if they had been about the Sacrament it self ; But if that will not do, he will try the old *Salvo*, and these divisions must be into Sects and Parties that were Heretical ; But how can it then be said, that these Divisions arose when they came together to these Feasts, what! did some of them turn Hereticks presently upon the Congress ? And become Orthodox again when they parted, and so turn Hereticks anew when they came together the next time ? And certainly if they were Hereticks the Apostle would have charged the rest to have cast them out, and not suffered them to Communicate with them at all, and that had been a proper and likely way to have put an End to such Disorders ; But this he grounds upon the verse following, *For there must also be Heresies among you*, and blames Mr. H. for omitting it, and would fain know what we have to say to it ; Why I'll tell him in a few words ; This does not shew that the Divisions he reproves were Heresies, but gives us the reason why he believed the report which he heard of their Divisions, I hear there are Divisions or Schisms amongst you, and I partly believe it, for there must be also Heresies amongst you, I need not wonder if there be Schisms amongst you, for I know there will be Heresies also, which are a great deal worse ; Thus it has been understood by very Learned Expositors, and it seems the Natural import of the words, and their connexion with the former, and the Particle [*also*] makes it plain enough.

But after all, if this Gentleman will in one place make Schism to be Heresie, and in another a disorderly behaviour at the Communion Table, or at the Feasts attending it, he will advance an Idea of it, much more Novel than Mr. H's, and it will fairly acquit Dissenters from being Schismatics, for he can neither charge us with Heresie, nor any such disorders at the Lords Supper.

The last place agitated is, 1 Cor. 12. 15. That there be no Schism in the Body ; Mr. H. acknowledges that Schism is that which breaks or slackens the Bond by which the Members are knit one to another ; Here the Gentleman presently claps hold, and says, that is done notoriously by Separation and breach of Communion, yes, no doubt Communion is broken by breach of Communion, we won't dispute that, but all Separation does not break Communion, if we only separate in those things wherein Christian Communion does not consist, the Bond is firm still, therefore Mr. H. well added,

but this <sup>is</sup> Bond not an Act of Uniformity in the same Ceremonies, but of true Love and Charity, the Gentleman replies, nor is the obligation of that Bond taken away by an Act of Indulgence; We grant it Sir, it is sufficient for us that the Act of Indulgence takes away the Obligation of the Act of Uniformity, we do not desire it should take away Mens Obligations to preserve the Unity of the Church, which we question not is as Sacredly observed in our Assemblies as in yours.

He falsely charges Mr. H. with saying that true Love and Charity is the onely Bond by which Christians are knit together, he does not say it is the onely Bond, but certainly it is the Bond, though not the onely one, for they are United by Faith also, but it is onely the breach of this Bond of Love, which is properly called Schism; He tells us the Apostle insists upon several other ties and obligations whereby Christians are knit together, and let us hear what they are; They are incorporated into one Society or Body, but is that a tie by which they are knit together, or does it not rather shew us what they are when united together? Their being animated by one Spirit, and so having one Hope, and being within the One Covenant of Grace, are not so properly the Bond by which we are United, but the effects of our Union to Christ by Faith, and it's that is properly the Bond or Uniting Grace on our part, that joins us to the Head God in Christ, and from this the other Grace of Christian Love results, by which the Members are Morally united one to another; How far the Unity of the Ministry is absolutely necessary to the Unity of Christs Body, has been already discussed in the former part of this Treatise.

He concludes his Reflections upon the Enquiry, with the same ingenuity which has all along appeared in him; He acknowledges that Charity is a comprehensive Virtue, and every Sin is a violation of it, as Theft, Murder, Treason, but as it would not be good Logick to make Uncharitableness serve for a definition of them all, so neither in the case of Schism; And we acknowledge it would not, and where does he find that Mr. H. makes uncharitableness the Definition of Schism, he makes it but part of the Definition, the *Genus* onely, and this Gentleman, by his own pretty Colloquy makes it to be the Generical nature of all Sin, but the Enquirer adds the *Differentia*, taken from the subject, those who agree in fundamentals, and its object the smaller things of Religion, and this with its *Genus* makes up the compleat Definition of that which Scripture calls Schism.

But the account which this Gentleman has given of it, is so uncertain and various, so far from a Definition, that it falls short even of a bungling Description.

In one place he affirms, where there is Schism there is a breach of Communion, p. 9. in another, there was a Schism amongst the Corinthians, and yet they were in the same Communion, p. 22. In one place it is Heresie, p. 21. In another place Fornication, p. 20. In another rude and disorderly tricks at their Love Feasts, p. 29. In one place it is opposing their Orthodox Governours,



vernours, p. 26: In another place, it is siding with them, p. 25. and yet this is the Man that cannot endure any body should be thought a Conjuror in Logic and Divinity besides himself.

I hope the Enquirer is got safe out of this Gentlemans Hands: I now proceed to do the Vindicator the same Justice, in which I shall be brief, because the merits of the Cause are discussed already, and his little scurrilous Reflections are not worth our notice.

The Citizen of *Chester* presented his Adversary, with a List of the Names of those that had done Wonders in proving the Dissenters Schismatics, and the Vindicator repay'd him with another of those that have defended them from that Charge: And adds whether these have not done as much to prove the Imposers Schismatics, as the former to prove the Dissenters such, is referred not to the judgment of an interess'd Party, but of all the unbyas'd part of Mankind; Our famous Surveyor asks, *Where shall we have a Council of such; For those that have a Liturgy and Ceremonies and Bishops are certainly for us, and those that are for none of these, are all byass'd against us.* But Sir, the Question to be referr'd is not whether a Liturgy and Ceremonies and Bishops are lawful, but whether such as ours be so, and whether it be lawful to take those Oaths, and make those Declarations that have been required of us, and as there is no Church upon Earth requires the same things, as this of our Nation, so we have judges enough of this matter that are disintereffed, without going to Pagans or Atheists for them, and what their thoughts are has been already in part discovered.

He would help *T. W.* to prove that a Man who is not divest'd of all *Review. p. 34.* Christian Temper, Humility and Consideration, may yet be in a desperate condition, because it seems *He may not have Grains enough of these Virtues to save him;* What! must we have a statical Divinity too? If a Man has Christian Faith, though it be but as a Grain of Mustard-seed it will be effectual to Salvation, and I know not why the same may not be said of all other Graces, he that has them not in the prevailing degree, has them not at all, that Man in whom Pride is Habitually prevalent, has not the least Grain of Christian Humility; The Gentleman therefore must find out some other *Salvo* against the next time.

The Vindicator took notice of a blunder in the Citizen in calling the same Person, Sceptical, a Slighter of our Religion, Obstinate and Perverse, &c. And thought Sceptical and Obstinate, did not jump well together; This Gentleman endeavours to help him here too, and says *T. W.* intended these as so many several Characters, and did not intend to unite them all in one Person; But it is certain he did, he speaks in the singular number, if thou be Sceptical — I shall altogether glory in thy Scoffs, &c. These are all joined together no disjunctive particle betwixt them, all lodged in one single Person, in a distinct Paragraph, as a third Man distinct both from the Church-man and Dissenter, and this is so plain, that Alderman himself, (as this Author calls him) was too honest to deny it.

The

The Question concerning the ninth Article of the Creed, and in what sense *T. W.* sets it up as a Standard of Controversie, is fully manifested in the Preface to this Paper; And 'tis a very groundless suggestion, that we have any design to lay it aside, that we may impose whatever Notions we please upon the World, we very well approve of the Creeds, and have subscribed to them, and to the Doctrine of the Church, as laid down in the Articles, and it were to be wished your own Ministers kept as close to those Articles in their Preaching as ours do. The Vindicator has been already defended in the exceptions he took at *T. W.*'s date of the Origination of the Catholick Church; This Gentleman says he spoke of it under the denomination of Christian, which is very false, as those that read the passage will see, however the Alderman is beholden to his brisk Champion, for he'll say any thing in the World to help him at a dead lift.

He puts the question, *Whether when our Saviour said, upon this Rock I will build my Church, he did not speak of it as yet unbuilt?* I answer, if by unbuilt, he means unfinished, it is true, for the Church Universal is a building *in fieri*, and will not be compleated till the End of the World; But if by unbuilt, he means unbegun, I say there is no reason so to understand the words of our Saviour, for he has been building his Church upon the same Rock there spoken of, from the Fall of Man, but I am loth to spend time upon such quibbles, if the Gentleman had mentioned the Christian Church, or if he had not said a few Lines before, that the Angels were the most glorious Members of the Church, I dare say the Vindicator would not have taken notice of it, nor have blamed him no more than *Tertullian*, and *Jerome*, for speaking of the Christian Church in its infancy; And though the Vindicator acknowledges the Apostles and Disciples were the Church, he did not say the whole Church, much less that the Church then had its first existence, I hope when these Gentlemen call the Church of *England*, the Church, they do not mean the Church Universal.

Review. p. 35.

P. 36.

I desire this Gentleman to give us some better proof than his bare Word, that ever the Apostles imposed upon the Disciples things indifferent, especially because they tell us, it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to them not to do so; And he must also prove that the Bishops are their Successors in the same plenitude of power, till then he beats the Air, but gains no Victory.

The Vindicator bewails the slow Progress the Gospel has made in the World, and imputes it in part to the needless Ceremonies, with which Men have encumbered it, and want of Personal worth in the managers; To this he replies, *The Divines of the Church of England are no way concerned in it*; No? What! not when there is so much notorious Debauchery amongst us, that insolently out-faces all the Letters and Orders whereby our Pious King and Queen have stirred up Magistrates and Ministers to do what they can for the suppression of it? And yet these Gentlemen see no want of success of the Gospel in *England*, but are for recommending to the Dissenters a Journey to *China* or *Tartary*; Alas Man! The design of the Gospel is not onely to

give

give Nations another Title, but to make the Inhabitants other Men, and if you be not sensible that has made but a slow Progress in *England* in that which is its main design, you'll make but an ill Watch-man upon the Walls of your Church.

And if our Ministers should take such a journey as you are pleased to assign them, it is not the first time that they have been forced to leave the dear and pleasant land of their Nativity, and expose themselves to the fatigues of a tedious Voyage, and all the dangers and hardships of a Pagan Wilderness, that there at least they might enjoy that liberty of serving God according to his Word, amongst the Barbarous Indians to whom they brought the Glorious Gospel, and what toils they under-went, and what success God was pleased to give them, the whole World has seen and admired.

*Vid. The Life of Mr. Elliot.*

The Citizen acknowledged that in the Primitive times there was a multiplication of Churches, by reason of the increase of Believers, The Vindicator was well enough pleased to hear him say, that the increase of Believers will make it necessary to multiply Churches, for according to the Episcopal Model there may be thousands of Congregations, and Millions of Souls, and all but one Church under one Bishop still, the Gentleman now must mend it a little, and he puts in distance of place, as that which must be added to multiplication of Believers, but still, if a Bishop may be Pastor of a Thousand Parishes, some of them a hundred Miles distant, and may do his work by Delegates, I see no Reason (as the Vindicator speaks) why we may not have one Bishop in a Nation, or one over all the World; He that can delegate one part of his Work, may delegate the whole, and then it is but multiplying those Delegates, and he may have a Diocesis Universal, as that of the old Gentleman at *Rome*.

He requires a Scripture instance to prove that when believers grow too numerous for one assembly, a Colony must be sent out under Independent Officers; But he should rather prove, that such a Colony must be still in dependance upon the former, for if such a Colony desire to have a Bishop and Presbyters of its own, those that refuse to suffer it, must be able to give some good reason for it; And to keep all new assemblies in dependance upon the first Church, would make *Jerusalem* the Mistress of the Catholick Church, as *Rome* pretends; This Gentleman tells us, there may be a multiplication of Independent Churches, for such are the Episcopal, and he says, he is not for Acting a Diocesis, or contending about the Extent, and therefore I suppose if it should be no bigger than a Parish, there's no harm done to the Essentials of Episcopacy; What need therefore of proving by Scripture that a new Colony must be an Independent Church, when the Author himself acknowledges it may be so, and if it desire to be so, I know no body has power to hinder it, unless it be the Civil Magistrate; And how far it is within his Jurisdiction I shall not dispute.

The Magnitude of the Church of *Jerusalem* has been often debated, and before any thing can be concluded from thence, on the behalf of Prelacy, they

they must tell us, how many of those Converts, we read of, were constant Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, and stated Members of that Church ; For if the greatest part of them might be of those that came thither at the Feast of *Pentecost* it will spoil the Demonstration ; And they must also prove that they were under the Government of one Bishop ; And asking questions is not proving that it was so. At that time we read of such numerous Converts, they had the Apostles amongst them, who taught them from House to House, and we have no account of their being under the Government of one Bishop, but what comes from *Hegesippus*, and an obscure *Clement* Writers of no Authority.

And it ought to be considered, that if the Church of *Jerusalem* were so very numerous, it is strange they could all be received in so small a place as *Pella* ; Let this Gentleman hear one of the Grand-fathers of his own Church, Archbishop *Whitgift*, thus, "How few Christians were there at *Jerusalem* not long before it was destroyed, being about forty years after Christ ? "Does not *Eusebius* testify, that they were all received into a little Town called *Pella*, yet the Apostles spent much Time and Labour in Preaching there. And *Epiphanius*, confirms the same truth, saying, That all the Believers, and elsewhere, all the Disciples inhabited in *Pella* ; Let him remove these difficulties out of the way, and then he may more plausibly serve himself of this instance.

What he says in his 39<sup>th</sup> Page is meer Banter, we neither condemn Bishops, nor set up Altar against them, nor are in any Covenant against them, nor refuse to Communicate with them in Sacraments and Prayers ; A bare denial is answer enough at any time to a bare assertion, We hold Communion with them in all that is essential to Episcopacy or the Worship of God, and if they will not let us Worship God with them in the same Congregations, but turn us out by their Impositions, let them look to it, what ever is culpable will lye at their Door, we are willing at any time to Communicate with them on Christs Terms, but if they refuse it, we must not lose the Ordinances of the Gospel, for a point of Humane Order, such as Parochial Communion ; Here, I think Mr. *Chillingworths* answer to the Jesuit, is very pertinent. "Notwithstanding your Errors, we do not renounce your Communion totally, and absolutely, but only leave communicating with you in the practice and profession of your Errors ; The Trial whereof will be, to propose some form of Worshipping God, taken wholly out of Scripture, and herein if we refuse to join with you, and not till then, you may justly say we have utterly, and absolutely abandon'd your Communion."

He is pleased to say, "Though we pretend to be United to the Head, yet not to the Body, it being hard to find several Members united into one Body, and yet still remaining all Independent ; If he means Independent in Point of Government one over another, the Episcopal Churches are all Independent in that sense ; (as Dr. *Sherlock* very well proves) and therefore by this Gentleman's

Defence of  
the Answer  
3. Treat. c. 6.

*Epiph. Hercul.*  
30. & de *Pan-*  
*der & Mens.*  
c. 15.  
*epistles de un-*  
*ivertu de christo*  
*in Pella.*

See the Peti-  
tion for  
Peace. 1661.

P. 15.

Vind. of Prot.  
Princ. p. 71.

man's talk, cannot be United into one Body ; If he means Independent in Point of Communion, I know no Churches that pretend to it.

He affirms that Bishops succeed the Apostles, in their Authority over the Presbyters and People, *For*, (says he) *it is not reasonable to suppose that any branch of Authority given by our Saviour to his Apostles died with them.* But this would prove too much, for then we must have some Supream Officers in the Church, that have Power over Bishops, as well as over Presbyters and People, for so had the Apostles; and we may retort his following words *Id. Review*, upon himself, *If their Authority over the Bishops expired with their Persons, why should that over Presbyters continue after them, unless he will suppose that the Inferiour Clergy are the only Persons that need the Regulation of Superiours, all Multitudes must have Governours, and the Bishops are certainly too numerous a Populace to be all Independent :* Now let the Gentleman give us an Answer to this, and it will serve very well for an Answer to himself; It does not concern us to shew that the Apostles Commission was only a Patent for Life; but if any Persons now-a-days shall pretend to have a Patent for the Apostleship, it behoves them to produce it well attested.

The Vindicator observed, that the Authority of the Apostles was Universal, and the same over all Churches; and this Surveyor says, *The Bishops succeed them in the same Authority, only the exercise thereof is limited by humane Agreements*, and asks the Vindicator, whether a Bishop be not as truly a Bishop, and a Presbyter as truly a Presbyter, in any other Man's Diocese or Parish as in his own ?

But here he puts things together, that should be kept distinct; a Bishop in the received and ordinary sense of the word is a Relative term, and always connotes a Bishoprick, either in Possession or Title, as his Charge and Cure; and therefore though he be Bishop in another Man's Diocese, he is not Bishop of that Diocese; indeed, as a Minister of the Gospel, he may Preach, and Administer the Sacraments any where that Providence casts him, and gives him an opportunity of so doing: and if this be all the Episcopal Power they pretend to, we will allow it to be as Universal as they please; but the Power of Jurisdiction over Ministers and People, which they call the Apostolical Power, they have not any where but in their own Dioceses, and yet even that Power the Apostles had all the World over, and could not be limited in it by any Humane Agreements whatsoever.

By this Notion our Gentleman has advanced, the Bishop of *Chesher* has no more Authority in *Cheshire*, than the Bishop of *Rome*, but what is founded *Review p. 40.* on Humane Agreements, and what thanks his Diocesan will give him for such a Doctrine, I cannot tell; for he afterwards acknowledges, that the Bishop of *Rome* has no Authority at all in *England*, which makes the whole Power of our Bishops to depend upon Humane Agreements, without which, he that has none at all, would have as much as they.

Or perhaps it is liable to a worse Consequence than that; for if every Bishop has Universal Power in all Dioceses, by the Grant of Christ, and is only



restrained in the Exercise thereof by Humane Agreements: then may the Bishop of *Rome* with Apostolical Authority make Canons for all *England*, and Excommunicate us all if we receive them not, for Christ gave him Universal Power, only it was limited by Humane Agreements which he never agreed to, and if he had, that could not render his Act unauthoritative, but only irregular; Only, the best on't is, any Bishop in *England* may make Canons for *Rome* too, and Damn them all, (Pope and Cardinals, and all) if they will not obey.

I would gladly understand this Doctrine a little better, and therefore I beg the favour of this Gentleman, to tell me, what Agreements these are of which he speaks; where and when made, and by whom? Are they only made by the Bishops amongst themselves? or had the People a hand therein? or does he mean the Laws of the Land? If Bishops can by mutual Agreement so restrain the Exercise of their Power, why may they not by the like Agreements, constitute one to be Head over them all.

Treat. of Supremacy, p. 120, 121.

I wish this Gentleman would go to School to a learned Doctor of his own Church, though he was not in Communion with him in these Notions; yet I hope no Schismatick for all that; 'tis the worthy Dr. *Isaac Barrow*, whose words are, "The Offices of an Apostle and Bishop are not in their own Nature well consistent; for the Apostleship is an extraordinary Office, charged with the Instruction and Government of the whole World, and calling for an answerable Care (the Apostles being Rulers, as St. *Chrysostom* saith, ordained by God, Rulers not taking several Nations and Cities, but all of them in common intrusted with the whole World) but Episcopacy is an ordinary standing charge affixed to One place, and requiring a special Attendance there, who (as St. *Chrysostom* saith) do sit and are employed in one place: Now he that hath such a General Care can hardly discharge such a particular Office; and he that is fixed to so particular an Attendance, can hardly look well after so General a Charge.

I need not repeat what has been said about the Powers of *Timothy* and *Titus*; what the Gentleman here alledges is anticipated and answered; He must prove that Presbyters may not do what *Timothy* and *Titus* did; that they may not ordain, that they may not reprove one another for their Faults, as they have occasion: He says, *These are the Powers that Bishops have exercised all along*; and so have Presbyters too: and if exercise proves the Title, they must therefore be Bishops also.

He adds, *The Congregational Invention allows of no such Officers, the most ordinary Pastors being all Independent, without ever a Timothy or Titus to Govern them, and therefore by Scripture stands condemned*; and if it be so, I am sure Episcopacy is involved in the same Condemnation; for the Bishops are by their own Party accounted the only Pastors, and the Inferiour Clergy are but their Curates, and yet these Pastors have none to supervise them, but are as Independent as can be, there's no *Paul* to govern these *Timothies* and *Titus's*, and therefore their Churches are (to use his own words) plainly contrary to the Apostolical Pattern.

And

And Dr. Morrice has told us, That it is not essential to a Bishop to have many Congregations under him, Bishops may be Pastors of single Congregations, yea, they may not have one Presbyter under them, and yet be Bishops still; for *Milles* the Martyr was a Bishop, and yet had no Christian in his Diocese; and yet I think there are few Pastors of our Congregational Churches, but what have Presbyters under them, so that Episcopacy and Independency may very well comport together; for Episcopacy is Independent, and may be Congregational, and if the one be condemned by Scripture, the other must fall with it.

Review, p. 69.

He says, *It is an idle fancy to suppose that the Office of Timothy and Titus was itinerant; for then, says he, they were out of their Office when they were at home, the one in Ephesus, and the other in Crete.* If by calling those places their Homes, he would insinuate that they were their proper Diocesan Sees, where they were to reside, 'tis a begging of the Question, and every Body knows that's the way of Idle Persons; it is as certain as our Bibles can make it, that *Timothy* was only to abide at *Ephesus* for a Season, till *Paul's* return out of *Macedonia*, 1 Tim. 3. 14. after which he accompanied *Paul* into *Asia*, Chap. 4. 13. from thence to *Italy*, Heb. 13. 23. thence *Paul* declares, he would send him to *Philippi*, Chap. 2. 19. and we find him at *Rome* again, Col. 1. 1.

And *Titus* was so far from being resident at *Crete*, that he was commanded away to *Nicopolis* before *Winter*, Chap. 3. 12. he was sent to *Corinth* and *Dalmatia*, and went up to *Jerusalem* with *Paul*, and came to him during his Imprisonment at *Rome*; These Removes our Gent. would have us to think were their Episcopal Visitations; but that would make the Dioceses of *Ephesus* and *Crete* to take in one another, and the whole Christian World too.

Gal. 2. 1, 2.

2 Cor. 2. 12.

2 Cor. 7. 13.

2 Cor. 12. 8.

2 Tim. 4. 10.

The *Vindicator* told *T. W.* that it would not agree with the Nature of a proper Succession, that two Bishops should succeed one Apostle in his Apostolical Power. This Gent. undertakes to prove it may, but by such kind of instances as signify nothing but his own inadvertency, viz. *When two Persons are Heirs to one in the same Estate, the Law calls them Successores partiarum*: But this will not do, an Estate may be divided into a Thousand Parts, and each of them have the Nature of an Estate still; but the Apostolical Power is Universal, the same in all places, and division here will make it another thing, according to the Account that *Mr. Bradford*, *Dr. Barrow*, and the best Protestant Writers give of the difference betwixt the Offices of Apostle and Bishop: *Paul* as an Apostle had the same Power at *Ephesus* as at *Crete*, and if *Timothy* had succeeded in the Apostolical Power, he must have had so too.

His Argument from the Division of the Empire, is as defective as the former. Empires, how great soever, are limited within certain Bounds, and may be divided; it is not of the Nature of Imperial Power to be over all the World, as it was of the Apostolical; 'tis a vain thing to talk of any Provin-

ces to which the Apostolical Power was limited, they had equal Power in all Provinces and Parts of the World; and so must those have too that succeed them in the Apostleship.

The Vindicator also desired to know how *Timothy* and *Titus* could succeed *Paul* in his Apostleship, whilst he was alive and in Plenitude of Power? This Gent. dares not undertake to unfold the Riddle; but so it was, *chuse what the Consequences may be; for (says he) it is evident, the Apostle gave them a Plenitude of Power within their respective Charges, chuse how much or how little he reserved to himself; But pray, Sir, think better of it, a Plenitude of Power confined to a particular Charge and Province, is not the Plenitude of Apostolical Power; and if he reserved any Power to himself within those respective Charges, they had not the Plenitude of Power there, but were under his Apostolical Jurisdiction still, and therefore did not succeed him in it; and if the Apostle reserved to himself no Power over the Churches of Ephesus and Crete, he divested himself of his Apostleship; for he that had not Apostolical Power every where, had it no where.*

But the generous Surveyor is willing to compromise the matter betwixt them, *T. W. must call the Bishops Coadjutors only, whilst the Apostles were living, and the Vindicator must give them the Title of Successors after their Death.* And if by Successors, he means those that after them were employed in the great Work of the Ministry of the Gospel, we grant all true Bishops are their Successors, but then we must put him in Mind that the Bishops we read of in Scripture, were as much Bishops before the Apostles Death as after, and therefore their Episcopal Power did not come to them by Succession, nor did there at the Apostles Death any new Accession of Power devolve upon them.

Review, p. 42.

It was therefore the most needless thing in the World to give the Primitive Fathers any trouble in this Matter; what if they call Bishops and Presbyters the Apostles Successors, so do we too, but do they say that they succeeded them in the Apostolical Power, or that the Apostleship was devolved upon them by the Right of Succession, and yet it is that, *T. W.* after his weak manner struggles to prove, and indeed no less will serve his turn.

This Gentleman is not so thoughtful as he should be when he says, *We make it such a mighty Mystery for a Bishop to Constitute his Successor; if by Constituting, he means Naming or Appointing who shall be his Successor, it is not impossible, supposing that God preserve his Life, and the Church Consent to that Appointment, tho' it be very inconvenient, and therefore forbidden by ancient Councils, but it is impossible for one Bishop to devolve his whole Episcopal Power upon another, and yet to keep it himself in as great amplitude as ever.* The Decretal and Canon Law will tell him a Successor comes not in place till the Predecessor be gone, that as long as the Bishop liveth no man can succeed him, that there cannot be two Bishops in one Place, this is most certainly true in the sense, wherein we now speak of Bishops, and sufficient to our present purpose.

Decret. par. 2.  
can. 7.  
Quaest. 1. c. 5.  
Vivente Episcopo, Can. 41.  
in an. Ecclesiast. 2.  
62, &c.

That

That which follows, about the certainty of Linus his succeeding Peter, of an uninterrupted Succession, of the Concession of Papiſts, has already been largely discussed in these Papers. It is possible *Irenæus* might Name all the Roman Bishops, and yet be Mistaken in their Order of Succession; and 'tis certain all is not to be taken for Gospel that *Irenæus* reports, even in matters of Fact, for he tells us, our Saviour lived to the Age of above forty or fifty Years, and said, he had this from all the Elders of *Asia*, who received it from St. *John* himself: How well is it that we have a more sure Word of Prophecy and History too, than the Testimony of *Irenæus*: As to the time of this Fathers Birth and Death, accounts are so various, and the probabilities on each hand so fair, that no modest man will be Positive in it, but Mr. *Dodwel* has taken upon him to fix it, and his Disciples make no Question, but he has done it infallibly.

The Vindicator had some Reason to put that Question concerning the Apostolical Succession in the Patriarchal Churches (which this Gentleman quarrels with) because he observed *T. W.* made *Linus* succeed *Peter* in the See of *Rome*, *Simion James*, in the Chair of *Jerusalem*, *Ananias* (I suppose it should be *Ananias* the Cobler, of whom before) St. *Mark* in the Church of *Alexandria*; and the account runs upon this Supposition that the Apostles, divided the World into several Provinces, and each of them was Bishop of his proper district, and those are called the Apostles Successors, that came into their several Sees after their Death, and these being but such a number, it would follow that the Succession, must be only propagated in these Patriarchats; this the Vindicator mentioned as what would be the consequence of *T. W.* his Scheme of Succession, which he only erected in those Churches, where he had an Apostle at the Head of the Roll; he never affirmed that it was the Opinion of *T. W.* or any other, that none but the Patriarchs were the Apostles Successors, but intimated, that such a Succession as *T. W.* described, would only be found in those Churches.

We now come to the proof of an uninterrupted Succession, and let us see whether this Gentleman can demonstrate it, better than his Alderman; it must be remembered that according to these men, the Truth of their Church, the Authority of their Ministry, the Validity of their Sacraments, and the Salvation of their Souls, depend upon this Line, and therefore it requires a proof suitable to the vast weight that is laid upon it; and whether he has given us such evidence let the Reader judge.

He tells us, "As far as we have an account we find the Succession regular; and we have no Reason to doubt of the like care in former Ages, we rely upon the Providence of God, and the Care and Integrity of our Ancestors, and no man shall bereave us of our Confidence. Confidence indeed! in the highest degree, but what if God has never promised such an unbroken line, how can we think his Providence should be engaged to preserve it, or where has he said it should be preserved in *England*? and what if our Ancestours who were Idolatrous Papiſts had no integrity, nor took no care of any thing but to flatter.

*Irenæus* l. 2.  
c. 39. Sub finem. *Asiam*  
*suorum quadraginta aut quinquaginta anni habens*  
*Dom. nostri,*  
*&c.*

+  
*Anianus*



flatter the Pope, and enrich themselves, and enslave the World; a miserable Faith and Hope, that depends upon the Care and Integrity of Apostate, Antichristian Bishops and Churches.

What he says about the Vindicators descending from *Adam*, as if it were as impossible for a Priest to come into a Bishoprick without Episcopal Consecration, as for a Man to come into the World, without ordinary Generation, is so perfectly ludicrous, that as I suppose it was only designed to make the Club merry, so I shall leave it wholly to them.

*Vid. Review,* But that which goes before must not be so soon dismiss'd, he pretends that we have as good Evidence of an uninterrupted Succession of Ministers Episcopally ordain'd as of pure and genuine Scriptures, and (says he) although we have not the Original Manuscripts to compare the One, nor entire *Facts* in the other Case, yet unless any will produce matter of Fact to shew that we are deceived, no man shall bereave us of our Confidence.

*P. 44.* But this will satisfy no Body, but those that are resolved to be Confident right or wrong; for,

*And in* That we have true Scripture is a thing much more capable of Demonstration, than that none of our Bishops have ever wanted Episcopal Ordination; it is much more easie to impose an unordained Person upon a particular Church, than a false Bible upon the whole World, in the latter all the World would be equally concerned to discover and reject the imposture, in the other a particular Diocese is only interested; in the one, they had a great number of Copies spread abroad, by which they might compare and try any that was offered to them, in the other they might have nothing but the Credentials, or Certificates of Persons dead or living remote, which might easily be forged, and they not able to find it out.

Nor could men lye under the same temptations to the one, as to the other.

And for the Authority of the Scriptures, we do not depend upon the single Credit and care of the Antichristian Churches, but of many others, that have not been made so drunk with the Wine of her Fornication. We have the *Greek, Armenian, and African* Churches, to assure us of this great point, but as to the continued Episcopal Ordination of our Bishops, we solely depend upon the credit of a blind and deceitful Generation, that have outdone all Mankind in deceiving the Nation and putting a thousand cheats upon the World.

In the matter and stile of the Scriptures themselves, we have most excellent *testimonies*, and Indications of their divine Original, but no such inherent Mark or Character of Divinity is found upon the whole Line and Order of Episcopacy.

It was always accounted the most horrid Sin in the World to forge or adulterate the Scriptures, but I have already proved in this Treatise that in Poppish Ages, the Power of Ordination was sometimes given to those that were no Bishops; and though this was one of the incroachments which the Popes made upon the rights of Episcopacy, as *Dr. Sherlock* tells us, yet if they assumed such a power, it is greatly to be suspected they did not fail to execute it.

Besides,



Besides, none ever pretended that the Salvation of mens Souls does absolutely depend upon having a compleat and entire Canon of Scripture, but according to these men it does wholly lye upon an entire Line of Succession.

In these and many other Circumstances, these two Cases vastly differ; and he that has no more to say for the Authority of Scripture than this man has said for his Line, would greatly betray the Honour of his Profession, and he that would persuade the World, that we have no better Evidences of the Truth of our Bibles, than of such a Line, does the worst Office imaginable to the Interests of Christianity, and (to use his own Words) it is one of the slyest Libels upon Scripture that I have lately met with.

Here again the business of the Abbot of *Hye* falls in our way, but having said it already, I shall not make Repetitions; This Gentleman would Save and Patch up the Business by Suppositions. Suppose the Succession of Bishops from that Abbot were extinct, and true Bishops called in to Consecrate, then the Line would be pieced again: And yet all the Churches and Christians, that lived under the Successors of that Abbot were damned by their Doctrine; but what if they were not all extinct? which is unreasonable to suppose, and impossible to prove, suppose that Line should reach to our times, then all within it are Lay Impostors; I think the Bishops ought, to oblige these men that talk at this rate, to demonstrate that the Line is Right, or else Chastise them severely, for making their Authority depend upon a Supposition impossible to be proved.

The Gentleman denies, that the Church of *Rome* allows an Abbot Presbyter to Consecrate a Bishop, and makes challenges, and oppresses his Margin with Citations out of the Schoolmen; and indeed to give him his due, he has endeavoured all along by the redundancy of the Margin to make amends for the emptiness of the Page, which looks like a shallow muddy stream, hemm'd in with a flowry Bank on each side; but who knows not that there is a manifest difference betwixt what the Court of *Rome* Practises, and what the Schoolmen determine.

*Bellarmino* himself, upon the Note of Succession, confesses that the Pope may by particular Delegation, impower Mytred Abbots, though meer Presbyters, to supply the place of two of the Bishops, in the business of Consecration; The Presbyters of *Alexandria* Consecrated their Patriarch for several Generations, *Cassianus* tells us of a young man called *Daniel*, who lived amongst the Monks of *Egypt*, about the Year, 420. first made Deacon and afterward Priest, by his Abbot *Paphnutius*, who was but a Presbyter, and all the Schoolmen are not on the Gentlemans side, for some of them say, that Presbyters by the Popes Dispensation may without the concurrence of a Bishop ordain Deacons.

He Points at some Canons, that forbid Presbyters to Ordain, and say, every Bishop must be Ordained by three Bishops at least; but he that argues from their Canons to their Practice is a meer Sophister, as appears by the Concession of *Bellarmino* just now mentioned; and he may as well say, no Bishop

*Sam. August.*  
*Ord. Sect. 13.*  
*Filic. Jefa. de*  
*Cassius Conf.*  
*par. 1. Tract.*  
*9. c. 5.*  
*Alens. sum.*  
*Total. par. 4.*  
*9. m. 5.*

- Cor. Cath. 4. Bishop ever obtained the Promotion, by Simony, or never Ordained with-  
c. 23.  
Tit. 1. 7, 8. Drunken, Unclean, or Quarrellsome, because by very Authentick Canons, such are declared incapable of the Office.

His forty seventh, and three following Pages, are all built upon a mistake, which this Gentleman, as well as T. W. fell into I know not how, as if the Vindicator ever denied the Validity of the Ordination of Schismaticks, whereas he only argues, from his Adversaries Assertion, that by Schism Men, and Societies, are utterly cut off from the Catholick Church, and have no place, nor Interest therein, and then I am sure it will follow that they cannot be the Subjects of Apostolical Power, which can never be found out of the Visible Church; I hope it has been sufficiently proved in this Treatise, that this is the just Conclusion from such premises, and to talk of a remaining Character, that includes the Power of Ordination in those that are utterly cut off from the Church is perfect gibberish, and if this Gentleman thinks fit to answer what has been already said to it, we shall willingly discourse him further about it.

In the fiftieth Page he speaks like himself, *We believe with St. Jerom that the Power of Ordination belongs only to the Bishop, and your Ordinations made by Presbyters are void and null, and we take you for no more but Lay Intruders.*

We are not much concerned, what this Gentleman believes of us, nor what he takes us for, but he should have been just to St. Jerom, though he may think 'tis no matter, whether he be so to us or no; it would be very strange, if St. Jerom should say any such thing as he pretends, and we should have been glad, to have seen the Passage cited, if he refers to that, *Quid enim facit Episcopus, excepta Ordinatione, quod non facit Presbyter?* that has been sufficiently explained in these Papers already, to intend, not any distinct Power that Bishops had by the Law of God, but what the Custom and Practice of the Churches at that time had reserved unto them.

- Review. p. 50, 51. He tells us, of some nice Enquiries, that have been made into our Mission, and that they suspect many of our first Apostles, from whom we derive our Orders, were never Ordained, and supposes the Vindicator had not met with this Observation. And it may be he has not, and therefore 'tis ten to One, but it is false, for if it were true, the Dissenters were much more like to know it, than such as he, with all his nice Enquiries and Suspicions.

He wonders the Vindicator should lose so many pages against this Line of Succession, which if it would do no good, would certainly do no harm. Ay, but it would do the greatest harm in the World to the Interest of the Church and Christianity; to make the Salvation of men depend upon such a Line, and that's the Notion the Vindicator spends some pages upon, and he cannot do a better Office to the Church or Protestant Religion than to expose it, and if that be not done effectually already, by my Consent, either he or some Body else, shall spend as many pages more upon it. We

We come now to the Vindicators account of Ordination, viz. That it is a publick Approbation of Ministerial Abilities by competent Judges; This ( says the Gentleman ) is such a way of making Clergy men as never was heard of before, will a publick Aprobation of a mans Abilities invest him in his Office, will a Testimonial from the Inns of Court make a man a Judge without a Commission from the King?

Now here he confounds Commission and Investiture together, as if they were the same thing which 'tis certain they are not; The Commission always goes before the Investiture, and 'tis that which gives the Power, and the Investiture, is only necessary to the regular Exercise of that Power, which is given by the Commission. If this Gentleman would have the World believe, that it is the Bishops that give a Minister his Commission and Ministerial Power, as the King gives the Judge his Authority, he sets up Episcopacy in the Throne of Christ, and is condemned by the Reformed Churches; it is Christ alone who grants the Commission, in the great Charter of the Gospel, wherein he has declared that he will have a standing Ministry, and tells us, what the Ministerial Qualifications are, and has promised to work them by his Spirit in Men, in Order thereunto; all the Ordainers do, is *designare personam*, to Point out the Person that has those Qualifications, and this publick Designation, with the mans own Dedication of himself to the Work is the Investiture, and sets the man apart to the regular Exercise of that Power, which Christ by his Charter without, and those Qualifications within has given unto him.

The Case is something like to that of making a Person Mayor of a Corporation, the People or Burgeses have the Power of choosing and the Recorder or Steward the Power of Swearing him, and yet none of these confer the Authority, but only design the Person, who receives his Power from the Prince alone, by the Charter of the place, as his Instrument.

It is the great command of God to his Church, that the Gospel be Preached, Religion Propagated, Churches Gathered, and Governed, and Sacraments Administred; He has not named the Persons that are to do this, but he has described them by their Qualifications, and Persons so qualified if they find also a promptitude to undertake the Work ( which I suppose is that which the Church of *England* means, when she enquires of the Candidates, whether they be moved by the Holy Ghost to undertake that Office are to seek for a regular Investiture, and the Ordainers are commanded to invest them by a solemn Approbation, that is, declaring that they find in them those Qualifications, by which the Gospel describes a true Minister of Christ.

We grant that this Investiture is most regularly performed by the Ministers, and should not ordinarily be without them; which seems to be grounded on this Reason, ( for all Gods commands are highly rational ) the Ministers are ordinarily to be thought, the most competent Judges; but as the Investiture it self is not of the Essence of the Power, but only requisite to the due exercise of it; So it is not of the Essence of the Investiture that it be

R

perform-

performed by Ministers, but other competent Judges may do it where they cannot be had, or will not do it upon lawful Terms.

This Case of Ordination has been very well argued by the excellent Mr. Baxter ( of whom England was not worthy ) in his Disputations of Church Government; and because I do not know that any one has directly assaulted him in it, I would refer this Gentleman to it, where he will find it illustrated thus.

“ If the Sovereign Power make a Law, that there shall be Physicians Licensed by a Colledge of Physicians to Practise in this Common Wealth, and describe the Persons that shall be so Licensed; This plainly first concludeth that such Persons shall be Physicians, but secondly, *de ordine*, that they shall be thus Licensed. So that if the Colledge should License a Company of utterly insufficient men, and murderers that seek mens death, or should refuse to License the Persons qualified according to Law, they may themselves be punished, and the qualified Persons may act as authorized by that which bindeth *quoad materiam*, and is by the Colledge, not by them frustrate *quoad Ordinem*; So it is in this Case in hand.

This is a rational account of the matter, and such as may give all Christians full satisfaction in the Truth of their Churches Ministry and Ordinances, without flying up into the Clouds, and inventing the Mysteries of an uninterrupted Succession, indelible Characters, and such like stuff.

What has this Gentleman to Object against it, why? He tells us, no man can preach unless he be sent, and no man can send him, but he that is Authorized for that purpose; If he means by this, that no man ought to Preach, but those that are Ordained (and this he must mean, if he speaks to the purpose) the Constant Practice of his own Church Confutes him, which allows men to preach several times before Ordination, that their Qualifications may appear, and they may acquire a Title; but if no man can lawfully Preach till he be Ordained, they ought not to allow this upon any account whatsoever, not so much as to make experiment of their Abilities.

I would ask this Gentleman, when your Candidates Preach before Ordination, is there no Possibility, that their Preaching may do good to the hearers, and should they not in Preaching principally intend their Edification? If not 'tis taking the Name of God in vain; but if they may do good, and should make that their chief aim in those Sermons, then the Gentleman must find out some other sence for that Text he mentions, which has been already explained in the first Chapter of this Treatise.

Mat. 28. 18. He thinks, *Ordainers are obliged to follow the Example of Christ, who when he sent out his Apostles, recites his own Commission, All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth: Go therefore — as my Father sent me, so I send you.* But it is the highest piece of Arrogance in the World, to pretend to the same Power that Christ had in this matter; He had Power to institute the Office, and give the Authority of the Ministry; Men have only the Power of investiture, as the Bishops in Crowning our Kings; and as Christ



Christ never made those Words of his the set form of Ordination, so 'tis too bold for any Bishop how great soever, to apply them to himself in that Office.

That which follows, about appointing *Embassadors for Almighty God* Review, p. 52 *without his Order*, is already in substance answered, if by appointing Embassadors, he means giving the Commission and Power, neither Lay-men nor Clergy-men must presume to do it; if he means investing them that God has chosen, with the Ceremonies of Ordination, 'tis fit that the Ministers should do it, if they may be had, or will do it on lawful Terms, but if not, better it were omitted, than that the Embassy of Reconciliation should not be delivered to the World; I suppose their unordained Candidates bring such an Embassy to their hearers (I am sure they should do so) and if they do, then we have Embassadors, without an appointment in his Sense of the Word.

The Cases of Necessity which the Vindicator mentioned, are such as may happen, and to neglect the publick Worship of God, in expectation of a Gift of Miracles, which I suppose he means, by the reviving of the *Charismata* would be a profane Omission. He thinks to ridicule us out of it, by putting the Case concerning a company of Women cast upon an Island, &c. Well, what if a man should say, that the best qualified Sister among them might be chosen by the rest, as the Abbess, to be most constantly employed in Prayer and Exhortation, till better help could be had; were not the Iberians Converted by a Captive Maid; and was it not the constant Custom of *Ruffia*. l. i. c. the Church of *England* till the *Hampton Court* Conference, to permit Women to Baptize Children in Case of Necessity, and how zealously did the Bishops endeavour to defend the lawfulness of it at that time. The Bishop of *London* affirmed, the words of the Common-Prayer-Book intended, a Permission of Private Persons to baptize in such Cases, and said it was agreeable to the Practice of the Primitive Church, alledging the great numbers that were Baptized, *Acts* 2. Which it was improbable the Apostles alone could do, and added that some Fathers were of the same Opinion, and when the King opposed it, the Bishop of *Winchester* replied, that to deny Private Persons to Baptize in Case of necessity, were to Cross all Antiquity and the Common Practice of the Church, it being a Rule agreed on by Divines, that the Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament. *Faller Cent.* 17. l. 10. p. 9.

Their great Ecclesiastical Politician Mr. *Hooker* sets himself to prove that Baptism by any man in Case of Necessity is valid, and says it was the Voice *Eccles. Pol. p.* of the whole World heretofore, and (elsewhere) That God hath committed the Ministry of Baptism unto special men, it is for Orders sake in the Church, not that their Authority might add any force to the Sacrament.

Now is it not the most unaccountable perverseness in the World to make Episcopal Ordination so indispensibly necessary? when the most solemn acts of the Ministry (the Application of the Seals) are allowed by themselves to those that have no Ordination at all, yea to a Sister, whether well quali-



fed or no, in which they have quite out-done us, no such thing being ever practised in the Presbyterian Churches.

He endeavours to prove the necessity of such Ordination, from the Case of the *Abyssines*, who were contented to be without those Ordinances which are to be dispensed by Priests, till the return of *Frumentius* from *Alexandria*; but pray, what Ordinances are those that are to be dispensed by Priests only, I thought this Gentleman had made Preaching, the Gospel of Reconciliation one of them, I am sure for that end, he press'd that Text, How can they preach except they be sent? Does he mean the Sacraments? why the Fathers of his own Church tell him all Antiquity allows the Baptism of Private Persons in Case of necessity, and why not the other Sacrament too? the Words of *Tertullian* are well known, *offers & singit*, he argues from that Text, *He hath made us Kings and Priests unto God, and to his Father*, "It is the Authority of the Church that hath put a difference between the Clergy and the Laity, and which hath established this sacred honour for the Body of the Clergy, this is so true, that where there is no Clergy-man to be had, thou dost Celebrate, thou dost Baptize and thou art to thy self a Priest, now where there are three, there is a Church though they be Laicks, for every one lives by his own Faith and God is no respecter of Persons: If therefore these *Abyssines* deprived themselves so long of the Sacraments they were needlessly scrupulous.

*Tert. de Corona Militis, & de Baptismo. p. 602. 603. Laici etiam jus est — Sufficiat in necessitatibus.*

*Ruffinus* tells us, that when *Frumentius* by the Providence of God was advanced to some Power in the Realm during the Kings Minority, he carefully sought out such as were Christians among the Roman Merchants, and exhorted them to meet together and pray, which they did and when the Indians came amongst them, they instructed them in the Christian Faith, and all this was done before he took his Journey to *Alexandria*, and tho' *Valestinus* will needs be so nice as to distinguish betwixt Oratories and Churches, and betwixt Preaching and instructing; yet here was the great End of Churches and Bishops and Sermons happily attained, *viz.* The Conversion and Instruction of Poor Souls, a greater Seal of Mission than that of working Miracles, wherewith ('tis said) *Frumentius* returned.

The Gentlemans other instances, prove no more but that in the sence of those times, it was very desireable to have Ministerial Ordination and that they rather chose to be at a great deal of pains than to want it, but it is not the desireableness, but the necessity of it, that the Vindicator denied, and the Church of *England* you see, will stand by him in it; Nor was it his design to ridicule the Ceremony of laying on of Hands; But that foolish conceit, that by such contact, there is a transiſion of power from one to another, in a continued Line; The Presbyterians themselves always use that Apostolical rite in their Ordinations, tho' they do not think it necessary to the conveyance of Authority.

He charges the Vindicator with want of Sense or Integrity; in reporting the Notion of a Patriarchal Right to Sovereignty; But if he can explain that Notion any better 'twould have been a very obliging thing to have done it; I must confess I am as dull as the Vindicator in understanding it, and cannot imagine how that Patriarchal Right should exist any where but in the Line of the Eldest Family in the World; For if at any time you set up a Younger Brother, it must be upon some other Title, not the Patriarchal, but either the exprets Nomination of God, or Election, or Conquest, or the like; But to claim the Regal Power by Patriarchal Right, without pretending at least to the Line of Primogeniture, is a thing I despair of ever understanding; That this Patriarchal Right was ascribed to our Kings in the Late Reigns, is too well known, and will not be so easily forgotten by the Nation, as it is denied by those that then filled Mens Ears with it, a Noble Peer pretty well known to *T. W.* once publickly Animadverted upon this Doctrine, and the Authors of it, and observed that such a right could be but in one Person in the World at once, and no Person in the World could tell who that was.

What he mentions p. 56. concerning the Decency of Ceremonies, has been obviated in the former part, and there he may learn from the Bishops and Doctors of the Church of *England*, that the Worship of God is never the better performed for them, and therefore never the more decently, and Bishop *Saunderson* condemns him for a Superstitious Fop that thinks otherwise, this case is therefore adjudged already; If the Motion he makes of allowing the Bishops to be judges of Decency, is to be so understood, as that whatever the Clergy in Convocation Judge Fit and Decent, must presently be submitted to, and that the Pastors of Particular Churches or People (how mean or half-witted soever) must not make use of their discerning faculty, this I confess is one way to end controversies, by trying us all up to the Inspirations of the Canonical Tribe, and this is that some of them have been long aiming at, but surely 'tis too far of the day, to impose at this rate upon English Men.

The Surveyor endeavours to justify their Excommunications, by the old pretence of contempt and malice, but these Men ought to be very certain that it is Malice and not real Scruple of Conscience, against which they so severely proceed; And they have no power to impose those things upon Men, which they know thousands are dissatisfied in, and they themselves acknowledge, render their Duties not a whit more pleasing and acceptable to God; That scandalous and disorderly Persons are to be disciplin'd according to the demerit of their Actions and Behaviour. No Church or sober Christian that I know of, will deny but that persons of Orthodox Judgment, and Sober Conversation, should be Excommunicated, Fined, Imprisoned, Banished and Ruined, because they dare not comply with such things, as have been imposed in *England*, is a practice not to be justified by any Rule in our Bibles, or President in the Reformed Churches, but is indeed contrary to Humanity it self.

hed or no, in which they have quite out-done us, no such thing being ever practised in the Presbyterian Churches.

He endeavours to prove the necessity of such Ordination, from the Case of the *Abyssines*, who were contented to be without those Ordinances which are to be dispensed by Priests, till the return of *Fruementius* from *Alexandria*; but pray, what Ordinances are those that are to be dispensed by Priests only, I thought this Gentleman had made Preaching, the Gospel of Reconciliation one of them, I am sure for that end, he pres'd that Text, How can they preach except they be sent? Does he mean the Sacraments? why the Fathers of his own Church tell him all Antiquity allows the Baptism of Private Persons in Case of necessity, and why not the other Sacrament too? the Words of *Tertullian* are well known, *offers & singis*, he argues from that Text, *He hath made us Kings and Priests unto God, and to his Father*, "It is the Authority of the Church that hath put a difference between the Clergy and the Laity, and which hath established this sacred honour for the Body of the Clergy, this is so true, that where there is no Clergy-man to be had, thou dost Celebrate, thou dost Baptize and thou art to thy self a Priest, now where there are three, there is a Church though they be Laicks, for every one lives by his own Faith and God is no respecter of Persons: If therefore these *Abyssines* deprived themselves so long of the Sacraments they were needlessly scrupulous.

*Tert. de Corona Militis, & de Baptismo. p. 602. 603. Laicus etiam jus est — Sufficiat in necessitatibus.*

*Ruffinus* tells us, that when *Fruementius* by the Providence of God was advanced to some Power in the Realm during the Kings Minority, he carefully sought out such as were Christians among the Roman Merchants, and exhorted them to meet together and pray, which they did and when the Indians came amongst them, they instructed them in the Christian Faith, and all this was done before he took his Journey to *Alexandria*, and tho' *Valestinus* will needs be so nice as to distinguish betwixt Oratories and Churches, and betwixt Preaching and instructing; yet here was the great End of Churches and Bishops and Sermons happily attained, viz. The Conversion and Instruction of Poor Souls, a greater Seal of Mission than that of working Miracles, wherewith ( 'tis said ) *Fruementius* returned.

The Gentlemen's other instances, prove no more but that in the sence of those times, it was very desireable to have Ministerial Ordination and that they rather chose to be at a great deal of pains than to want it, but it is not the desireableness, but the necessity of it, that the Vindicator denied, and the Church of *England* you see, will stand by him in it; Nor was it his design to ridicule the Ceremony of laying on of Hands; But that foolish conceit, that by such contact, there is a transfusion of power from one to another, in a continued Line; The Presbyterians themselves always use that Apostolical rite in their Ordinations, tho' they do not think it necessary to the conveyance of Authority.

He charges the Vindicator with want of Sence or Integrity, in reporting the Notion of a Patriarchal Right to Sovereignty; But if he can explain that Notion any better 'twould have been a very obliging thing to have done it; I must confess I am as dull as the Vindicator in understanding it, and cannot imagine how that Patriarchal Right should exist any where but in the Line of the Eldest Family in the World; For if at any time you set up a Younger Brother, it must be upon some other Title, not the Patriarchal, but either the exprels Nomination of God, or Election, or Conquest, or the like; But to claim the Regal Power by Patriarchal Right, without pretending at least to the Line of Primogeniture, is a thing I despair of ever understanding; That this Patriarchal Right was ascribed to our Kings in the Late Reigns, is too well known, and will not be so easily forgotten by the Nation, as it is denied by those that then filled Mens Ears with it, a Noble Peer pretty well known to *T. W.* once publicly Animadverted upon this Doctrine, and the Authors of it, and observed that such a right could be but in one Person in the World at once, and no Person in the World could tell who that was.

E. of W.

What he mentions p. 56. concerning the Decency of Ceremonies, has been obviated in the former part, and there he may learn from the Bishops and Doctors of the Church of *England*, that the Worship of God is never the better performed for them, and therefore never the more decently, and Bishop *Saunderson* condemns him for a Superstitious Fop that thinks otherwise, this case is therefore adjudged already; If the Motion he makes of allowing the Bishops to be judges of Decency, is to be so understood, as that whatever the Clergy in Convocation Judge Fit and Decent, must presently be submitted to, and that the Pastors of Particular Churches or People (how mean or half-witted soever) must not make use of their discerning faculty, this I confess is one way to end controversies, by tying us all up to the Inspirations of the Canonical Tribe, and this is that some of them have been long aiming at, but surely 'tis too far of the day, to impose at this rate upon English Men.

See the Review, p. 37.

The Surveyor endeavours to justify their Excommunications, by the old pretence of contempt and malice, but these Men ought to be very certain that it is Malice and not real Scruple of Conscience, against which they so severely proceed; And they have no power to impose those things upon Men, which they know thousands are dissatisfied in, and they themselves acknowledge, render their Duties not a whit more pleasing and acceptable to God; That scandalous and disorderly Persons are to be disciplin'd according to the demerit of their Actions and Behaviour. No Church or sober Christian that I know of, will deny but that persons of Orthodox Judgment, and Sober Conversation, should be Excommunicated, Fined, Imprisoned, Banished and Ruined, because they dare not comply with such things, as have been imposed in *England*, is a practice not to be justified by any Rule in our Bibles, or President in the Reformed Churches, but is indeed contrary to Humanity it self.

To

To what he says about the Greek Churches, p. 59. It is sufficient to reply, If the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son be not an Article of Faith, we desire to have a rule to distinguish what is *de fide* and what not in those Creeds; But if it and the Greek Churches object against it, then T. W. has excluded them, unless, he will say that ours is not the true Athanasian Creed, and if it be not, why must it be put into the Liturgy, and Subscribed and Assented to, under that denomination? He endeavours to help his Alderman out, about the *same Table*, and tells us, he meant something else by it, than the *same Table* in *Specie*, but since he has not told us what that *more* is, we may suppose he wanted a handsome *Salvo*, for he durst not say it must be the same numerically, and it would be hard to find any thing betwixt those two kinds of Identity; He tells us *To have the same Prayers, is to join with the Church where we live in its Holy Devotions*, and so do Dissenters join with the Churches where they live, which are as true Churches, and their Devotions as Holy, as if they were more large and splendid, for any thing that yet appears to the contrary.

In the 60th Page, he acknowledges that to have the Government of many Congregations is not essential to a Bishop, nor to have Presbyters under him, for *Milles* the Martyr had no Christian in his Diocese; But it is Ordination that makes a Bishop; If therefore our Ministers have all the Ordination that is necessary to a Bishop by the Word of God, they are Bishops, though they be but Pastors of single Congregations, and now if this Gentleman cannot prove by plain Scripture that a Bishop must have a distinct Ordination from that of a Presbyter, to advance him into a Superior Office, he has lost the Cause, and here we hold it and expect plain and direct evidence to this very point when ever the Reviewing humour returns upon him. And if the Pastors of single Congregations have all that is essential to Bishops, then our Diocesans are a new Species of Bishops, which St. *Cyprian* disowned in his Prefatory speech to the Council of *Carthage*; And indeed it is liable to very just prejudices, for when Bishops have taken away from the Pastors of Particular Churches, these Rights and Powers, which God hath given them, and engrossed all to themselves, and their Diocese is become too large for their Personal Inspection and Administration, they are forced to set up Officers of humane institution to exercise those powers under them, which they have ravished from Gospel Ministers, that by numerous Dependencies and large Revenues, they may gain that pre-eminence, which some Men began betimes to contend for; See Mr. *Baxters* treatise of Episcopacy never yet answered.

There is nothing more plainly shews these Mens contempt of Antiquity when it speaks not on their side, than denying the Peoples power of Election, which is confirmed unto them by the Canons of divers Councils and Ample Testimony of the Fathers, as Dr. *Rule* has proved; And though we will not say such consent is essential to the Ministerial Power, yet it is certainly necessary to the Pastoral Relation, for the Bishops and Ministers could have

Ambrose in  
1 Tim. 3. Episcopii & Presbyteri una Ordinatio est, uterque enim est sacerdos.

Rational Defence, p. 3.  
Sect. 6. p. 197.



have no certain cure (in such places where the Civil Magistrate does not interpose) but by the Peoples consent; This Gentleman tells us the consent of the Ministers and People of the Diocess is not necessary, — but it is left wholly to the discretion of the Church, and I wonder what that Church is to whose discretion this is referr'd when the Ministers and People are left out; will he say it is in the Power of the Bishops of other Diocesses, to impose a Bishop upon any, without the consent of Minister and People; And must we by the Church understand the Bishops alone without Ministers and People as if they had nothing to do in those matters that are left to the Churches Discretion; This lets us see what these Men drive at, and how gladly they would enslave the whole World to the humours of a few, and those not always the wisest or best of Men.

That the Nomination of our English Bishops is vested in the King, is very pleasing to Dissenters, especially under the Government of one so Wise and Good as ours is; But then we must say the Power they receive from the King and Laws, is not properly Spiritual Power; And we are willing to own them as having Humane Authority over us, *circa Sacra*, by the appointment of our Governours, as far as by Law we are under their Jurisdiction; And certainly many of them are too wise to pretend to any more, since our Laws expressly condemn such pretensions, as has been already proved, by the very Letter of the Law in that case.

The Gentleman tells us *The Vindicator* shewed his Abilities, in mentioning Ignatius, who advises the Bishop to hold frequent assemblies, and to enquire after all by their names, not despising the Men Servants or Maid Servants, and he would fain shew his Abilities, in enervating so plain evidence, and would impose upon us a great many Negatives and Peradventures, which we must help him to prove, We must prove, *That those Assemblies, met only in one place, that they were no more than ordinary Congregations, that the Bishop had no body to assist him in the remoter parts of his charge, that no man else acquainted him with the frailties and misdemeanours of particular*; These and a great many more such Negatives we must prove, which we are no way obliged to do, we insist upon the plain words of Ignatius, and he must prove his peradventures himself, or we shall take no notice of them; The Author of the Enquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Churches, offers to prove that these Diocesses were no larger in the number of Church Members, than our present Parishes; But whether that be so or no, I will not be positive; For it is manifest enough, the first step towards Prelacy, was committing the Government of the Church to one, which before was managed by several in common, the next was to make that Church as large and great as could be; By keeping new formed Congregations under their Jurisdiction; and we have early instances of such Incroachments.

These Men take the Liberty of making words signify any thing that serves their present purpose. If *Irenaeus* say, the Presbyters are the Successors of the Apostles, there Presbyter must signify Bishop, for fear of spoiling  
the

*Review*, p. 65. the Plea of Succession, If *Tertullian* say, they never receive the Eucharist from any but the Presidents, there President must not signify the Bishop, but the Presbyter, for it seems in a Bench of Presbyters they are all Presidents, though there be a Bishop in *Cathedra* amongst them; Such Men will never be at a loss for something to say.

Though the *Vindicator* trusting perhaps to his memory, mentioned the Sacrament of the Eucharist instead of Baptism, yet it amounts to the same thing, for if the Bishop was to take the Confections of all that were to be Baptised, his Diocese could not be of the same Model with ours, which such a thing would be altogether impracticable; This Gentleman wonders the *Vindicator* should be so nice in the Notion of Succession, p. 19. And afterwards so loose as to make it no more but conformity to the Apostles Model in Government and Worship, but the wonder will cease, when he considers that in the former place, he took Succession in the Sence *T. W.* used it, as that which gives the Bishops their Title to Apostolical Power, and here he takes it in the true Sence wherein the Fathers use it, whose words will never prove, that the Apostles left them their Apostolical Power, but onely that ordinary Pastoral Power which was eminently included in the former.

The *Vindicator* grants that for persons wilfully to withdraw themselves from such Particular Churches, as are framed according to Gospel Rules, and impose no new or needless terms of Communion, is to act Schismatically, because it cannot be without breach of Charity; The Gentleman replies *Yes it may through the Prejudices of Education, or want of Understanding*, that is to say, they may wilfully withdraw for want of Understanding; If their ignorance be not wilful, it does not come up to the Case as the *Vindicator* stated it, but if it be wilful ignorance, sure there is something of Uncharitableness in it.

His two last Pages are a very fit Epilogue for such an Opera, he rakes together all the instances of wickedness that can be, and the Reader must take it for granted, that the Dissenters are the Criminals pointed at, though he does not think fit to say so; Such dealing and no other we have had from him all along; We desire him the next time to speak above board, let him name the particular Cases and Persons, and not by sly insinuations, prejudice the Minds of his Credulous Party, against those who abhor such things as much as himself.

Who are those that look upon all besides themselves, as Enemies of God, and Opposers of his pure Worship, as Reprobates and Damned Wretches? Such censures indeed *T. W.* passes upon all Dissenters (and the Reviewer has seconded him in it) they are Men out of the Catholick Church, and Communion of Saints, have no right to the Promises, are in a desperate Condition, their hopes of Salvation are unwarrantable and groundless Fancies, &c. They neither Pray with, nor receive the Sacraments, nor live under the Government of any Church, and therefore cannot be within the Communion of Saints; These are their own words; And as this Gentleman observes, 'tis no wonder

Arch Rebel,

p. 25.

Reply, p. 47.

Review, p. 53.

New Whigg

Atheists, p. 34.

if Men of such thoughts, make no scruple of the most Violent and Uncharitable practices. Consistory of  
Clowns, p. 61.

Who are those that are guilty of *Plundering and Robbing their Neighbours and taking away Mens Lives*? Sure he does not mean those that for above twenty years together made a Trade of breaking into the Houses of Protestant Dissenters, taking away their Effects, and casting them into Prisons, and suffering them to lye and perish there; what lamentable havock they made, is in part laid before the World by an Eminent Conformable Minister, and will be ere long further discovered. See the 4th  
part of the  
Conformists  
Pica.

Who are those that *refuse to have any dealing in Trade with Men of another Persuasion*? it would be madness in the Dissenters, for being the lesser number, they must needs be great losers by such a Project, but this indeed was the advice of *L'Estrange* when he was the Darling of the Party, Lay not out a penny with the Whigs; I confess I am not able to name the place, but I find it in a Paper concerning the Election of the Present Lord Mayor, and 'tis very probable these Gentlemen can turn to it when they please.

Who are those *pack'd Juries that he speaks of, and where the unjust Courts of Judicature*? I hope he does not mean those that condemned the Renowned Lord *Russel*, Colonel *Sidney*, Alderman *Cornish*, whom our Parliament has declared to be Murdered; Or those that gave such damages against Sir *Samuel Bernardiston*, Mr. *Dutton Cole*, Mr. *Culliford*: or the Judge and Jury that dealt so genteelly with Mr. *Papillon*, &c.

By those *cruel proceedings against a zealous Clergy Man that appears in Defence of the Church*; I would fain know whether he refers to the Barbarous Usage of *Dr. Oats*, for discovering the Popish Plot, or of the Ingenious and brave Mr. *Johnson*, for his Seasonable Advice to the Standing Army in behalf of the Protestant Religion and Liberties of England: And whether by *destroying of Princes* he means, the importunate invitation of some Spiritual Persons of Eminent Note, to the then Prince of *Orange*, to come and free them from the Tyranny of the Late King *James*; And that Infamous aftergame, that a certain Elder Brother, with other of his Family, were a playing, to bring in the Abdicated Prince again, and destroy their Generous and Noble Deliverer. If I have not been so happy as to hit upon the Gentlemen's true Meaning, he must e'ne blame himself for sculking so in Generals. See the L.  
1<sup>st</sup> Trial  
p. 53.

If he can convict any of the Dissenters of such scandalous practices, let him do it, and if the Churches to which they belong, neglect to do their duty in censuring and rejecting of them, they will be condemn'd by their own Principles; But I hope he would not have them to proceed upon such unproved Accusations and Libels as these, which it seems he advanced in such loose and general terms, because *he knew not by what Rules to fix these crimes upon particular Persons*; And certainly he had better to have suspended the Charge, till he knew how to make it out, than to arraign us so confidently upon it, and be forced after all, to Petition, that we would help him to prove it. See his Re-  
view. p. 69.

# Appendix.

**I**T is certain in such controversies as these, nothing is more necessary than to understand the matters of Fact, without which we shall never make a true judgment as to matter of Right; I shall therefore add a Brief Historical Account, of such passages as are pertinent to our present case, laying down this Law to my self, that I will report nothing but what in my Conscience I believe to be true, and for which I can produce good Authorities.

For AGs and  
Mon. p. 1239.  
Fuller Cent.  
16. & 242.

That the Reformation of this Land was encouraged by King *Hen. VIII.* rather upon private pique against the Bishop of *Rome*, than out of any hearty Love to the thing it self, is too plain to be denied, & that doubtless was the reason of the short & uneven paces by which it then moved, nothing must be done but with a saving to the Politick Maxims and Interests of the Court; The six Articles were put in Execution to the very last year of his Reign, and that Pious and Ingenious Lady Mrs. *Ann Askew*, suffered Martyrdom thereby, not many Months before that Prince himself gave up his Mighty Ghost.

See Fuller, lb.

His Son and Successor the Glorious King *Edward*, engaged himself in the Cause upon a better Principle, and would in all probability have improved it to a good degree of perfection, had not the stiffness of some leading Churchmen, and the shortness of that invaluable life, prevented him. In the beginning of his Reign, *Miles Coverdale*, *John Hooper* and others, who had fled beyond Sea upon the six Articles, returned into *England*; And finding how very defective the Reformation was, and how many Popish Ceremonies, Gestures and Vestments, were still retained, could not conceal their dissatisfaction; But *Cranmer*, and *Ridley*, and others, who by Politick compliances, had weathered out the Storm, very flissly defended them under the pretences of Antiquity and Decency.

The Unhappy differences betwixt *Ridley* and *Hooper*, about these things are sufficiently known, and so is that happy agreement to which they came when they were Prisoners for the Truth in the *Marian* days; And by *Ridley's* Letter to *Hooper* it appears that his sufferings had changed his Thoughts concerning those by-matters as he calls them, for which in Prosperity he had so warmly contended, he confesseth it was *Hoopers* Wisdom to reject them, and his Simplicity to urge them. "Your Wisdom and my Simplicity I grant hath a little jarred.

A learn-

A learned and worthy Person, that has lately descanted upon that Letter, B. of S. seems to think that this was only spoken out of *Ridley's* abundant humility and condescension, and that it should be taken for granted, that *Ridley* was in the right, and *Hooper* in the wrong, especially because a Law interposed, but (with all possible respect to that great Man) we cannot easily admit this supposition: We do verily believe *Ridley* was in the wrong, and though he acted according to his Judgment, which was really great in other matters, yet in this it was misinformed, and we think our selves obliged to believe him when he expressly says, it was his simplicity to jarr with *Hooper* in this matter.

And that which made his Rigor the more blameable was, that he persisted in it, notwithstanding the King's earnest Request to the contrary, first by the Earl of *Warwick*, then under his own Signet, wherein he highly commends *Hooper's* Learning, Judgment, Discretion and Probity, and promises to save the Bishops from all Penalties they might incur by passing over those Rites and Ceremonies that were offensive to his Conscience, but instead of complying herewith, *Hooper* is sent to Prison; no wonder if this caused *Ridley* to make such reflections upon himself, when he was under the like Confinement.

The Learned Author adds, "That *Ridley* spoke these diminishing things "of himself in the absence of the Law when it was repealed; but that I suppose does not in the least alter the case; for if his contending with *Hooper* was justifiable at first, it would have remained so still, and the quality of the action could not be changed by any thing [*ex post-facto*] but must needs stand good or bad as it was when first done; and under those Circumstances no doubt it was reviewed when the simplicity thereof was acknowledged; and I fear it will not so well consist with the honour that is due to the Memory of that blessed Martyr, to think that out of meer Complement to *Hooper*, he would disapprove of what he had done, had he really believed he had done well in it: He that was ready to suffer the utmost extremity for the great Truths of Religion, would not upon any account have repented his Judicious Zeal, for the Unity of the Church, and Decency of Religion, if he had so esteemed of it; but his Sentiments were now changed, and that which before he thought to be Wisdom and Zeal, he now confesses was simplicity.

Whilst this good Bishop was thus acknowledging his weakness, and gladly embracing those to whom he had been formerly somewhat troublesome; others of his Brethren, who had escaped the Fiery Tryal, and were not humbled enough to see their folly, were fomenting differences even in the Sanctuaries to which they fled.

The most famous Congregation of English Exiles was seated at *Frankfort*, where they had a Church granted them by the Magistrates, who required them to observe the Model of the French Churches in their Service, which they willingly consented to, forbearing to answer aloud after the Minister,

Troubles of  
*Frankfort*,  
printed 1575



omitting the Litany, Surplice, and other Ceremonies as superfluous and superstitious; instead of the Confession in the English Liturgy, used another, better fitted to the present time and state of Affairs, then sang a Psalm in Metre in a plain Tune, then the Minister prayed for the Divine Assistance, and so proceeded to the Sermon, then followed a prayer for all States, particularly for *England*, which ended with the Lord's Prayer, then the rehearsal of the Articles of our Belief, then another Psalm, and the Minister concluded with the Blessing.

Fuller Ch. Hist.  
Cent. 16.  
l. 8. p. 30.

In this posture the Affairs of that Church stood, when Dr. Cox arrived there out of *England*, who being a man of a high Spirit (as Dr. Fuller speaks of him) came one day into the Congregation and made a great disturbance amongst them, answering aloud after the Minister; and the next Lord's day one of his company, without the knowledge and consent of the Congregation, got up into the Pulpit, and there read all the Litany, using the English Ceremonies therein; this, no doubt, was done for the sake of Decency and Order, and Church-Unity, though impartial men will think, it was a very improper Method for the accomplishment of such designs.

Dr. Burnet  
acknowledges  
that this Dr.  
Cox was the  
unhappy oc-  
casion of all  
the Troubles  
at Frankfurt.  
Observat. up-  
on Riddell's Let-  
ter to Hooper.  
p. 4.  
Dr. Fuller, ib.

These Irregular proceedings, had almost ruined all; for the Principal Magistrates of the Place protest, if the Reformed Order of the Churches of *Frankfort* were not observed, the Doors should be shut upon them again; and thus says Fuller, the *Coxan* Party depressed, embrac'd a strange way to raise themselves, accusing Mr. Knox (the Pastor of the Church) of High Treason against the Emperor in words spoken several years before in another Land and Language, when he owed no Allegiance to him; and this was so zealously urged, that the Magistrates could do no less than will him to depart the City, lest they should not seem tender enough of the Emperor's Honour; so that at last Dr. Cox might say, (as the Historian observes) With great rather than good Wrestlings, have I wrestled, and have prevailed.

BAYNES Let-  
ters, p. 52.

When Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Throne, there seemed a fair prospect of further Reformation and Union, and divers of the Bishops that had been sufferers, were willing to have promoted it; but others were still tenacious of their Old Customs, and greatly affected External Pomp and Gallantry in Divine Service, and the Queen her self was very much of that humour, as appears by *Grindal's* Letter to *Bullinger* dated August 27. 1566. where he writes that all the Bishops who had been beyond Sea, dealt with the Queen to let the matter of the Habits fall, but she was so prepossessed, that though they endeavoured to divert her from prosecuting that matter, she continued still inflexible.

Ibid. p. 53.

And Bishop *Jewel* in a Letter to the same Person, dated July 16. 1565. writes of the Act concerning the Habits with great regret, and expresses some hopes that it might be Repealed the next Session of Parliament, if the Popish Party did not hinder it: And the present Bishop of *Salisbury*, who has obliged us with the Account of these Letters, adds, that he saw other Letters wherein it was asserted, that both *Cranmer* and *Ridley* intended to procure

procure an Act (in King *Edward's* Reign) for the abolishing of the *Habits*, and that they only defended their lawfulness, but not their fitness.

The same Learned Prelate, who favoured the World with these ingenious Letters whilst he was beyond Sea, has discovered the same Integrity and Regard to Truth and Moderation since his return, and in the presence of the most August Assembly, expresses himself thus:

"Here suffer me to tell you, that in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's*  
 "Reign our Adversaries saw no hopes of retrieving their Affairs, which had Dr. Burnts  
 "been spoiled by Queen *Mary's* Persecution, but by setting on foot *Divine* Thanksgiving  
 "sions amongst Protestants, upon very inconsiderable matters, I my self Serm. before  
 "have seen the Letters of the Chief Bishops of that time, from which it ap- the House of  
 "pears that the Queen's stiffness in maintaining some Ceremonies, flowed not Commons,  
 "from their Counsels, but from the practices of some disguised Papists; And Jan. 31. 1682.  
 "I have had in my hands the Original Journal of the lower House of  
 "Convocation in the fifth year of that glorious Reign, in which the matter  
 "of the Ceremonies was first argued, and when it came to the Vote, it was  
 "carried by the greater Number of the Voices of the Members that were  
 "present, to lay down all those Subjects of Contests, but the Proxies turned  
 "it to the severer side.

How unhappy the Effects of this Act for Conformity were, (which in the Convocation turned upon so narrow a Point) may appear by the words of a worthy Person then living, which are these; "For some five years together before the Subscription was urged, there was such Unity amongst  
 "the Ministers, and they joyned together, in all places so lovingly and dil- Mr. Nichols  
 "gently, that many thousands were converted from Atheism and Popery; Plea of the  
 "but when Subscription was urged, many godly worthy learned Preachers Innocent,  
 "were silenced, and deprived, the Nation distracted, many good Persons p. 206, 207  
 "grieved and offended, and Papists and wicked men encouraged and em-  
 "boldened.

These things were so obvious, that divers Lords of the Privy Council earnestly solicited for Moderation; and in an excellent Letter to A. Bishop *Whitgift*, and the Bishop of *London* set forth, that a great number of Learned and Zealous Preachers, were suspended from their Cures, and the Country of *Essex* and other Places, and many of their Rooms filled with Persons, neither of good Learning, nor good Name, but chargeable with great faults, as Drunkenness, Filthiness, Gaming, Haunting of Ale-houses, &c. wherein they earnestly entreat the Prelates, to take some charitable consideration of these Causes, that the People of the Realm may not be deprived of their Pastors, being Diligent, Learned and Zealous, though in some Points Ceremonial, they may seem doubtful in Conscience, &c. Subscribed by the Lord *Burleigh*, Earl of *Shrewsbury*, *E. Warwick*, *E. Leicester*, *L. Howard*, *J. Croft*, *Hatton*, *Walsingham*.

But they were put off with the common Answer, that the Ministers were Factioners, and Contemners of the Ecclesiastical Laws, and Authors of Disquietness.

See the Letter at large in Fuller's C. H. Book 9. p. 151.

quietness, and must not be suffered to exercise their Ministry without further Conformity.

Not long after, these things were taken notice of in Parliament, and the  
*Ibid.* p. 174. Honourable House of Commons Passed some Bills in favour of the Non-conformists, but the Arch-bishop was importunate with the Queen not to give her consent, and so nothing was effected. Still the Nation grew more and more sensible of the ill Consequences of the Bishops proceedings, and in the year 1587. The House of Commons presented to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, a Petition in sixteen Particulars, some against scandalous and insufficient Ministers, others desiring the abatement of certain Oaths and Subscriptions, tendred to persons at their entrance on the Ministry, and yet not expressly prescribed by the Laws of the Realm, and that Ministers might not be troubled for their omission of some Rites, prescribed in the Book of  
*Ibid.* p. 191. Common Prayer, &c. And divers of the Lords approved of this Petition, and spoke to it; But the Arch-bishop betook himself to his old Weapon, cries out the Church was a falling, makes his Prayers to the Queen, calls her a Goddess, and carries the point against them all.

*O Disser.*

Having thus baffled the Parliament, they proceed to the Imprisonment of Mr. Cartwright, the silencing of Mr. Traver, of whom Dr. Fuller gives  
 P. 216. us such a Character, as is no way to the credit of those that dealt so harshly with him; But this was not all, Mr. Udall, and divers others were condemned to dye, for writing against the Male Government of these Ecclesiasticks, which was now become a capital crime by one of the greatest stretches of  
 P. 222. Law that ever was heard of in England.

We now come to the Reign of K. James the first, and here I think it may be seasonable to wipe off that Dirt which *T. W.* has cast upon the Vindicator, for saying, that when this Prince ascended the English Throne, the Prelatic party dreading lest the Puritans should have too great a share of his favours; Bent all their Studies to create prejudices in him against them. The Citizen replies, *The ill opinion which the King had of the Puritans, was founded upon his own experience, and published long before he had any converse with the English Bishops; and transcribes a passage out of his ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΕΨΟΝ, where He says, Take heed my Son, of such Puritans, very Pests in the Church and Common-wealths, Whom no Deserts can oblige, &c.*

But the Gentleman ought not to have insulted over his Adversary in such opprobrious Language, till he had considered: That not a word of this was intended of the English Puritans, concerning whom the Vindicator spoke; For this Prince had but a little while before writ three Letters to Queen Elizabeth in favour of them, and therein speaks very honourably of Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Udall, who were esteemed the Leading Men of that party; And kindly interceded for those that Dissented from the Bishops, in the things at that time controverted amongst them.

Nor by the word Puritan did the King mean the Presbyterians, as such, if we may believe his own words, in the Preface to the aforesaid Book; where-  
 in

in he declares, That the Name Puritan did properly belong to that Sect amongst the Anabaptists called *The Family of Love*; "Because, says he, they think themselves Pure, and in a manner without Sin, the only true Church, and only worthy to partake of the Sacraments, of this special Sect I principally mean, when I speak of Puritans, divers of them, as *Brown, Penny*, and others, having at sundry times come into *Scotland* to saw their Popple;--- And indeed, I give this Title to such Brain-sick and heady Preachers, their Disciples and Followers, who refusing to be called of that Sect, yet participate too much with their Humours, in maintaining the above-mentioned Errors; and (the King further adds) I Protest upon my Honour, I did not mean it generally of all those Preachers or others, that like better the single Form of Policy in our Church, than of the many Ceremonies of the Church of *England*; or that are perswaded that their Bishops smell of a Papal Supremacy; No, I am so far from being contentious in these things, that I equally love and honour the Learned and Grave Men of either Opinion.

And that those called Puritans at that time in *England*, were not such Persons as are here described, appears sufficiently, from the earnest Endeavours both of the House of Commons and Lords of the Privy Council on their behalf, and the different account they give of them, who must needs be acknowledged very competent Judges; and it is observable, that the Familists in *England* took notice of this censure of the King's, and in their Petition to him when he came into *England*, they disown all Affinity with the Puritans, and speak reproachfully of them, under that Title themselves.

*Faller Church Hist. Book 10. p. 30.*

I hope this will abundantly acquit the Old English Puritans from being the Persons aimed at in those Royal Reflections, and therefore notwithstanding any thing in that Book, it may be very true that the Bishops flattered that King into an ill Opinion of them.

That some of our English Prelates endeavour'd to do very ill Offices betwixt the King and Presbyterian Party even before he came into *England*, is most certainly true, and it cannot be imagined that they would be less busie when they had him amongst them, Bishop *Bancroft* was more than ordinary active in such Designs, as appeared amongst other things by a Letter from one *Norton* a Stationer in *Edinburgh*, directed for him, and intercepted; upon Examination *Norton* acknowledged, that he was employed by *Bancroft* to disperse certain Questions, that tended to the Defamation of the Kirk, and Presbyterian Government. The same Bishop writ frequent Letters to *Mr. Patrick Adamson*, the Titular Archbishop of *St. Andrews*, (which were many of them intercepted) wherein he stirs him up to Extol and Praise the Church of *England*, above all others, and to come up to *London*, assuring him that he would be very welcome, and well rewarded by the Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

*Caldernwood's Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland, p. 248.*

*Ibid. p. 259.*

This

This *Adams* had composed a Declaration, which passed under the King's Name, wherein the whole Order of the Kirk was greatly traduced and condemned; The Commissioners of the General Assembly complained to the King of the many false Aspersions contained therein, which were so shameful, that the King disowned it, and said, It was not his doing, but the Archbishops, and prudently discarded that great Favourite, and gave the Rents of the Bishoprick to the Duke of *Lennox*.

The poor Gentleman thus abandoned, professes himself to be truly Penitent for what he had done, and makes a full Recantation which he Subscribed in the presence of a great many Witnesses, and directs it to the Synod convened at *St. Andrew's*; "Confessing, That he had out of Ambition, Vain-Glory and Covetousness, undertaken the Office of an Archbishop; That he had laboured to advance the King's Arbitrary Power in Matters of Religion, and Protested before God that he was commanded to write that Declaration by the Chancellor, the Secretary, and another great Courtier, and that he was more busied with some Bishops in *England*, in Prejudice of the Discipline of the Kirk, partly when he was there, and partly by Mutual Intelligence than became a good Christian, much less a Faithful Pastor, &c.

*Ibid.*  
Preface.

Now although the King fondly adhered to such kind of Men, whilst he hoped to advance his Prerogative thereby, yet when he began to perceive the ill Effects of such Conduct, he still deserted them, and in those prudent Intervals, would freely declare his good Opinion of the Presbytery, and their Form of Government, particularly in the National Assembly, 1590. "He thank'd God that he was King of such a Country, wherein, says he, there is such a Church even the sincerest Church on Earth, *Geneva* not excepted, seeing they keep some Festival Days, as *Easter* and *Christmas*, and what have they for it? As for our Neighbours in *England*, their Service is an ill mumbled Mass in English, they want little of the Mass but the Listings: Now I charge you, my good People, Barons, Gentlemen, Ministers, and Elders, that you all stand to your Purity, and Exhort the People to do the same; and as long as I have Life and Crown, I will maintain the same against all deadly.

*Cald.* p. 473.

Nay, when he took his leave of *Scotland* upon the Union of the two Kingdoms, he solemnly promised the Ministers of the Synod of *Lothian*, that he would make no Alterations in their Discipline; but when he came up to *London*, those who had been tampering with him and his Courtiers before, had a fair opportunity to accomplish their Design, which was the utter Abolition of the Presbytery in *Scotland*, and the Suppression of the Puritans in *England*; And (saith my Author) as soon as the English Prelates had got King *James* amongst them, they did not rest till Mr. *Melville* and the Prime of the Scots Divines were called up to *London*, and only for their Just Defence of the Truth and Liberties of *Scotland* against Episcopal Usurpations, were either Banish'd or Confin'd, and so sore Oppressed, that it brought many

*R. Bayle's*  
Vindication  
and Answer  
to the Decla-  
rat. p. 11.

of



of them with Sorrow to their Graves; and the whole Discipline of the Church was over-thrown, notwithstanding the King's parting Promise to the contrary.

The Nonconformists in England were so far from being brought over by the Severities of the former Reign, that they drew up a Petition about this time Signed by Seven hundred and fifty Ministers, desiring Reformation of certain Ceremonies and Abuses in the Church, which *Fuller* gives us at large; this was designed to have been presented before the Conference at *Hampton-Court*, but was deferred till after.

The Relation of this (so much talk'd of) Conference, as *Fuller* reports it out of *Barlow*, is justly suspected of great Partiality, and the Historian himself speaks doubtfully of it; and yet even in that we have a plain Indication of what temper the Court and Bishops were: It looks very odd, that when the King had allow'd several of *Dr. Reynolds's* Exceptions, he should threaten if they had no more to say, He would make them to Conform, or hurry them out of the Land, or do worse; a poor business! for a Prince to menace his own Subjects for Non-conformity to that which himself had formerly called an ill-mumbled Mass in English, and even now acknowledged, wanted some Reformation.

But we have this Matter set in a true Light, by *Mr. Patrick Gallwey*, in his Account of it from *London* to the Presbytery of *Edinburgh*, after it was *Calder* p. 474. Revised by the King's own Hand: The words are,

"Beloved Brethren, after my hearty Commendations, these Presents are  
 "to shew you, that I received Two of your Letters; One directed to His  
 "Majesty, the other to my Self for my Perusal, the same I read, closed and  
 "three days before the Conference, delivered into His Majesty's Hand, and  
 "received it back again after some short Speeches, upon those words in your  
 "Letter, *the Gross Corruptions of this Church*, which were then expounded;  
 "and I was assured, all Corruptions dissonant from the Word of God or  
 "contrary thereunto, should be amended: The Twelfth of *January* was the  
 "day of Meeting, at which time the Bishops were call'd upon, and gravely  
 "desired to advise upon all the Corruptions of this Church; in Doctrine,  
 "Ceremonies and Discipline; and as they would answer it to God in Conscience,  
 "and to His Majesty upon their Obedience, that they should return  
 "the Third day after, which was *Saturday*. Accordingly they returned to  
 "His Majesty, and when the Matter was propounded to them, as before,  
 "they answered, All was Well. And when His Majesty with great severity brought instances to the contrary, they upon their Knees with  
 "great earnestness, craved that nothing should be altered, lest the Popish  
 "Recusants punished for Disobedience, and the Puritans punished by Deprivation *ab officio & beneficio*, for Nonconformity, should say, they had  
 "just Cause to insult upon them, as Men who had endeavoured to bind them  
 "to that which by their own Mouths now was confess'd to be Erroneous.  
 "After five Hours Dispute had by His Majesty against them, and his resolution

"lution for Reformation intimated to them, they were dismissed for that day——&c. but it appears by the result, their importunity overcame him at last.

Dr. Fuller observes, That whereas before this Conference, it was disputable, whether the North where he long lived, or the South, whither he lately came, would prevail most on the King's Judgment in Church Government, now this Question was clearly decided. I hope now the Vindicator may be allowed to have some *Grains of Shame and Modesty common to Humane Nature*, though he ventured to say, That the English Prelates flattered King James into an ill Opinion of the Puritans, and the thing is not so plain or known a Contradiction as the Citizen pretends; and for him to tell the World at this time a day of the famous Piety and Virtue of that Prince, is ridiculous enough. Alas, the History of his Reign is too well known; his Contending with Parliaments; his Encouraging of Papists; his Secret Articles upon the Treaties with Spain and France; his greedy Desire of Arbitrary Power; his Prostituting the Honours, and Wasting the Treasures of the Nation, after a most inglorious manner, produced those ill Effects, under which these Kingdoms have laboured and languished ever since, till by the late happy Revolution our Antient Rights and Privileges were raised out of the Grave, recognised, and settled upon their true Basis once more.

The Unhappy Government of K. Charles the First, is now sufficiently Unveiled; especially by *Rushworth's Impartial Collections*. The Vindicator briefly hinted at those Irregular and Arbitrary Practices, that forced the Parliament to take up Arms for the Defence of their Liberties, and for rescuing the King out of the hands of those Councillors that had so fatally misled him; T. W. calls this *Notorious Calumny*, and says, *he could answer all the Instances particularly, but he refers to the Rolls and Acts of Parliament*; The Vindicator is willing to joyn issue with him here, and appeals to the several Petitions, Remonstrances and Speeches made in Parliament as they stand upon Record in the Journals of both Houses, and they are now made so publick, that no Man but one who has no Reputation to lose, would have offered to deny that which all the Nation that can read Books, know to be true. And I will also tell him, that there is not one passage mentioned by the Vindicator concerning the Male Administration of that King, but what he may find in the *Supplement to Baker's Chronicle*, a History never suspected for Disloyalty, but evidently partial the other way.

The Vindicator renew'd the Challenge to Name four Persons in that Par-

Dr. Burnet tells us, the Duke of Hamilton was dissatisfied with the Courses some of the Bishops had followed before the Troubles began, and could not but impute their first rise to the Provocations that had been given by them, *Memoirs*, p. 408.

liament, that were not in full Communion with the Church of England when the War began: It is true, many of them that were for Episcopacy, were highly offended at the Behaviour of some of the Bishops, as appears by the Speeches of the Lords Falkland and Digby, both great Royalists; and for my part, I desire

no other Evidence of the intolerable Usurpations of the *Landseian Party*, than

than what those Noble Lords have given us, which being now in so many Hands, by the Publishing the third part of *Rushworths* Collections I will not transcribe.

The Nonconformists indeed generally joyned with the Parliament in that Cause, which was doubtless as just and necessary, when first undertaken as ever was carried upon the Point of a Sword; But that it was without the least design upon the Kings Person, their Solemn League and Covenant plainly proves, and the many Declarations, and Remonstrances which they afterwards made, when they saw new designs laid and pursued.

In the Year, 1648. When the Republican Faction was at the highest, the Ministers called Presbyterian, in and about *London*, fearing that which afterwards happened, boldly Published a Vindication of themselves, and Exhortation to the People, part of which, I shall here Transcribe to let the World see, how shamefully they have been abused about the Death of that King, their Words are these.

"To this *Vindication* we are compell'd at this time, because there are  
 "many who very confidently (yet most unjustly) charge us, to have been  
 "formerly instrumental toward the taking away the Life of the King; and  
 "because also there are others, who in their Scurrilous Pasquils and Libels  
 "(as well as with their Virulent Tongues) represent us to the World as a  
 "Bloody Seditious Sect, and Traiterous Obstructors, of what all the God-  
 "ly People of the Kingdom do earnestly desire for the establishing of Reli-  
 "gion and Peace in that we stick at the Execution of the King, while yet  
 "we are (as they falsely affirm) content to have him Convicted and Con-  
 "demned, all which we must and do from our Hearts disclaim, before the  
 "whole World.

"For when we did first engage with the Parliament (which we did not  
 "till called thereunto) we did it with Loyal Hearts, and Affections to-  
 "wards the King and his Posterity; not intending the least hurt to his Per-  
 "son, but to stop his Party from doing further hurt to the Kingdom, not  
 "to bring his Majesty to Justice, (as some now speak) but to put him in-  
 "to a better Capacity to do Justice, to remove the wicked from before him,  
 "that his Throne might be established in Righteousness; not to Dethrone  
 "and Destroy him, which we fear is the ready way to the Destruction of all  
 "his Kingdoms.

*Vindicat. of  
the Minist.  
Printed for  
T. Underhill,  
Ann. 1648.  
Subscribed by  
C. Burgess  
D. D.  
W. Gouge,  
D. D.  
E. Stanton,  
D. D.  
T. Temple,  
D. D.  
G. Walker,  
E. Calamy,  
B. D.  
J. Whitaker,  
D. C. Wdrey,  
W. Spur-  
flow.  
L. Scaman,  
D. D.  
Sim. Ashe.  
T. Case.  
N. Presfet.*

T. Thorowgood.  
E. Corbet.  
H. Roborough.  
A. Jackson.  
J. Nalton.  
T. Cawton.  
C. Offspring.  
Sa. Clark.  
Jo. Wall.

F. Roberts.  
M. Haviland.  
J. Sheffield.  
W. Harrison.  
W. Jenkin.  
J. Viner.  
E. Blackwel.  
J. Croft.  
J. Fuller.

W. Taylor.  
P. Witham.  
Fra. Peek.  
Ch. Mye.  
J. Wallis.  
T. Watton.  
T. Bedford.  
W. Wickins.  
T. Manton, D. D.

Tho. Gouge.  
W. Blackmore.  
R. Mercer.  
R. Robinson.  
J. Glascock.  
T. Wharely.  
J. Lloyd.  
J. Wells.  
E. Needler.

N. Staniford.  
S. Watkins.  
J. Tice.  
J. Stileman.  
Jof. Bull.  
J. Devereux.  
P. Rusel.  
J. Kirby.  
A. Barham.

"That which put any of us on at first to appear for the Parliament was, the Propositions and Orders of the Lords and Commons in Parliament ( *June 20. 1642.* ) for bringing in of Money and Plate, &c. Wherein they assured us that whatsoever should be brought in thereupon, should be employed upon no other occasion, than to maintain The Protestant Religion, The Kings Authority, and His Person in his Royal Dignity, the Free Course of Justice, the Laws of the Land, the Peace of the Kingdom, and the Privileges of Parliament, against any force which shall oppose them.

"As for the present actings at *Westminster*, since the time that so many of the Members were by force secluded, divers imprisoned and others thereupon, withdrew from the House of Commons ( and there being not that Conjunction of the two Houses as heretofore ) we are wholly unsatisfied therein, because we conceive them to be so far from being warranted by sufficient Authority, as that in our Apprehensions, they tend to an actual Alteration, if not Subversion, of that which the Honourable House of Commons in their Declaration, of *April 17. 1646.* have taught us to call the Fundamental Constitution and Government of this Kingdom, which they therein assure us ( if we understand them ) they would never alter.

"Yea, we hold our selves bound in Duty to God, Religion, the King, Parliament and Kingdom, to profess before God, Angels and Men, That we verily believe, that which is so much feared to be now in Agitation, the taking away the Life of the King, in the present way of Trial, is contrary to the Word of God, the Principles of the Protestant Religion ( never yet stained with the least drop of the Blood of a King ) the Fundamental Constitution and Government of this Kingdom, as also to the Oath of Allegiance, the Protestation of *May 5. 1641.* and the Solemn League and Covenant; from all or any of which Engagements, we know not any Power on Earth, able to absolve us or others.

"Therefore according to our Covenant, we do in the Name of the great God ( to whom all must give a strict account ) warn and exhort all who either more immediately belong to our respective Charges, or any way depend on our Ministry, or to whom we have administered the said Covenant ( that we may not by our Silence, suffer them to run into that provoking Sin of Perjury ) to keep close to the ways of God, and the rules of Religion, the Laws and their Vows, in their constant maintaining the true Reformed Religion, the Fundamental Constitution and Government of this Kingdom, as also in preserving the Privileges of both Houses of Parliament, and the Union between the two Nations of *England and Scotland*, to mourn bitterly for their own Sins, the Sins of the City, Army, People and Kingdom, and the miscarriages of the King himself ( which we cannot but acknowledge to be many and great ) in his Government that have cost the Kingdoms so dear, and cast him down from his Excellency, into a horrid pit of Misery almost beyond Example; and to pray that God would give him effectual Repentance, and sanctifie that bitter Cup of Divine displeasure



pleasure, that Divine Providence hath put into his hand; and also that God would restrain the Violence of men that they may not dare to draw upon themselves and the Kingdom the Blood of their Sovereign, &c.

This was back't with a Letter to the General, and his Council of War to the same effect; and yet all this has not been sufficient to defend them from the malicious slanders of men, that either were then unborn or had not the Courage, to run those hazards for the sake of their unfortunate Prince as they did. The deplorable Death of this King, has been made great use of in the Late Reigns, to run down Dissenters, and to justify those unmerciful Laws that have been made and executed against them; and to make it the better serve such designs, they have made the highest Panegyricks upon that Prince, and his extraordinary Piety and Devotion, in which they have commonly taken their Text out of ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ, a Book which next to the Bible, excell'd all others in pure Seraphick strains, but alas the grave Cheat is at length discovered, and though some men are very angry, there is no remedy; for heat and ill Language will never retrieve its blasted Reputation; only the best on't is, there is another of the same kind, portraying his Unhappy Son in his Solitudes and Sufferings too, and those that regret the Disparagement of the former, may try whether they can support the Credit of the latter; but the World I hope grows too wise to be enamoured of such Pageantry.

The Vindicator affirmed, That it was by the Address and Interest of the Party called Presbyterian (under God:) That King Charles the Second was restored, and (he adds) the solemn Promises, fair Words and great Assurances, that were given them by the Church and Court Party, upon the Treaty of Restoration, are very well known, and the speedy and bare-faced Violation of all, is not to be parallell'd in Story; which T. W. misreports, as if the Vindicator had said that King Charles the Second was not to be parallell'd in Story, tho' afterwards, having cleared his Eyes he confesses, these things are charged upon the Church and Court Party, and how will he bring them off; he says, *All is Fiction and Forgery, for the King refer'd all to the Parliament, and they re-established and Confirmed all things to the satisfaction of the Nation in General.*

Well, if we cannot prove these things to be true, we will own the Forgery, and submit to all the Reproaches this Gentleman can heap upon us; I would feign know where the Fiction lies, Were there no Promises made by the Court and Church Party? or were they not broken? It is strange we should be obliged to prove that such Promises were made, when the Kings Declaration speaks it so plainly in these Words.

"We do declare a Liberty to tender Consciences, and that no man shall  
"be disquieted, or called in Question, for differences in Opinion, which do  
"not disturb the Peace of the Kingdom, and that we shall be ready to Con-  
"sent to such Acts of Parliament, as upon Mature Deliberation, shall be of-  
"fered to us for the full granting that Indulgence.

And



And in his Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, Oct. 25. 1660. he saith, "When We were in *Holland*, we were attended by many Grave  
 "and Learned Ministers from hence, who were look't upon as the most able  
 "and principal Assertors of the Presbyterian Opinions, and to our great satisfaction, we found them Persons full of Affection towards us, of Zeal for  
 "the Peace of the Church and State, and neither Enemies to Episcopacy nor  
 "Liturgy, but modestly to desire such Alterations in either, as without shaking the Foundations, might best allay the present Distempers, which the  
 "Indispositions of the times and tenderness of some mens Consciences had  
 "contracted for the better doing, whereof we did intend to call a Synod,  
 "and in the mean time, We published in our Declaration from *Breda*, a  
 "Liberty to tender Consciences ——— We need not profess the high Affection and Esteem, which We have for the Church of *England*, as it is established by Law, nor do we think, that Reverence in the least diminished  
 "by our Condescensions, nor peremptorily to insist upon some particulars of  
 "Ceremony, which however introduced, by the Piety, and Devotion, and  
 "Order, of the former times, may not be so agreeable to the present, but  
 "may even lessen that Piety and Devotion for the improvement whereof  
 "they might be happily first introduced, and consequently may be well dispensed with ——— And We have not the least doubt, but the Bishops  
 "will think the Concessions now made by us, just and reasonable, and will  
 "cheerfully conform themselves thereunto ——— that Kneeling at the Sacrament shall not be imposed, nor the Cross, nor Surplice, nor any compelled to the Subscription, or Oath of Canonical Obedience, &c.

Behold the Promises that were made, I hope, he would not have us prove that they were not performed; But it seems the King left all to the Parliament, and they re-established matters to satisfaction, but this will not prove that these Promises were not broken, but only that they should not have been made: The King at that time seemed willing to have kept his Promise, and he had some honest Counsellors about him that advised him to it; and in Order thereunto by his Commission, He authorized divers Learned Persons of both Perswasions to consult together and agree on such Alterations in the Liturgy as were necessary to tender Consciences.

The Presbyterian Divines not one Dissenting, offered to submit to Archbishop *Usher's* Primitive Form of Episcopacy, and to a stated Liturgy, and drew up a most excellent One for that purpose, which for aptness and gravity of Expression, excellent Coherence and Method, and suitableness to all the Emergencies of humane Life, was incomparably beyond the old one; And when that would not be received, offered some amendments of the old one, and would have complied with it; but the Bishops treated them after a disdainful, imperious manner, and would yield to nothing for accommodation, the Truth of this cannot be doubted by any that have seen the Proposals to the King, the Petition for Peace, and Account of the Proceedings of the Commissioners at the *Savoy*, which an ingenious Conformist having lately

lately read, confessed to me, that was a brave Opportunity for Comprehension, and he was fully satisfied that the after Schism lay at the Bishops door.

And indeed it is no wonder that Consultation was so unsuccessful, when it appears the leading men amongst the Bishops, were so far from intending any such thing as Comprehension, that their great design in Treating with the other Party was, to know what they would stick at, that so they might be sure to shut them out; and it is credibly reported that Arch-Bishop *Selden* should say, now we know their Minds, we'll make them all Knaves if they Conform, and it was a remarkable saying of a Reverend Dean (*T. W.* has often heard of ) when a sober Gentleman shewed some regret that the door was so strait that many sober Ministers could not have Admission, replied, *it was no Pity at all, if we thought so many of them would have Conformed, we would have made it straiter.*

The Act of Uniformity, which they got in 1661. is justly esteemed the Source and Spring of all that Discord, Persecution, and Distraction the Nation has groaned under for many years, and indeed no better Fruits could be expected from it, if we consider the scandalous Arts that were used for the obtaining of it; and though I am weary of Transcribing, yet I will insert that remarkable Story, that Captain *Tarranton* tells us, in His full discovery of the first Presbyterian Sham-Plot, Printed at London for Francis Smith near the Royal Exchange, 1681.

Where speaking of the Kings Gracious Declaration touching Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1660. ( part of which I have already recited ) he says, " If the Parliament had pass'd it into an Act, it had probably cemented the greatest part of the Protestants throughout the Nation, but some, both of the Clergy and Laity, that bore the greatest sway, rejected it, and so his Majesties good and peaceable Intentions proved Abortive. These men ( by whose Instigations you may imagine ) instead of an Act of Union, resolve upon an Act of Uniformity, which they could not but know would prove the greatest Bane of Contention that ever was in the Nation, and some of the Leading Church-men were heard to say, they would have an Act so framed, as would reach every Puritan in the Kingdom, and that if they thought any of them would so stretch their Consciences as to be comprehended by it, they would insert yet other Conditions and Subscriptions, so as that they should have no Benefit by it; But the King and Parliament they feared were not yet fully prepared for the passing of such an Act, thereupon a Contrivement was set on Foot to make a Presbyterian Plot, and this was the first they ever took in hand, and because it was never taken Notice of by some, and forgotten by others, I shall therefore set it down at large; which I can the better do, because I was a great sufferer therein, and what I relate, if occasion be, I can prove by Letters and many living Witnesses.

" This Sham-Plot was laid in about thirty six Counties of England, but I shall

"shall write principally of that part of it which was executed in *Worcestershire*, the Month of *November* in the Year 1661. Several Letters were drawn up and delivered by Sir *John P*— to one *Richard N*— his Neighbour, to carry to one — *Cole* of *Martly*, about four Miles from *Worcester*, who is now living. This — *Cole* according to Instructions, delivereth a Pacquet of Letters to one — *Churne* of *Witchbinford*, (who also is, or lately was alive, and dwelt near *Martly*;) This Pacquet of Letters was carried by *Cole* and *Churne* unto Sir *John P*. (from whom it came) and before him *Churne* makes an Affidavit, That going early in the Morning to his Labour, he struck his Bill upon a Hedge to cut a Thorn, and by and by on the other side the Hedge, he spied a Scotch Pedlar, putting up Letters hastily in his Pack, and being affrighted (as he supposed) he left that Pacquet behind in the Ditch, and went down a Lane leading to Coll. *John Birch* his House.

This Oath being made, and the Pacquet delivered (as aforesaid) and opened, it presently appeared that there was a Conspiracy on foot to stir up Rebellion in the Kingdom, and to raise an Army for that purpose, and that Capt. *Andrew Tarranton* was to Command a Party in those Parts, for which purpose there were several Letters directed to him from some Ministers and others; Particularly, one from Mr. *Baxter* Minister of *Kidderminster*, intimating that he had provided a considerable Body of Men, well arm'd, which should be in readiness against the time appointed. Another from Mr. *Ambrose Sperry*, intimating that he had order'd him 500*l*. which was lodg'd in a Friends hand (not named) and should be ready for him whenever he should send for it; Several other Letters and Treasonable Papers were pretended to be in that Pacquet, all which occasioned the raising of the Militia of that County, and the City of *Worcester* was filled that Night with Horse and Foot; Early the next Morning about Two of the Clock, an Officer with a Troop comes to Mr. *Tarranton*'s House, and seeing Lights in most of the Windows for a Season he made a halt, but anon he drew near the House, and demanded Entrance. Mrs. *Tarranton* told him, she would open the Doors, provided he would come in with no more than two Persons besides himself, to which he assented, and when he was come in, demanded of Mrs. *Tarranton*, where her Husband was? She answered, he was not at Home. The Officer replied, he was at Home the Evening before. She told him, he was; but he is now gone to one Mr. *Mitchel*'s House at *Hittinton*; but to let you see that he knows upon what Design you come, He hath left his Man with a Horse ready Saddled, to Conduct you to him. Some of the Party being Volunteers out of *Worcester*, observing the words and deportment of Mrs. *Tarranton*, went presently Home again, amongst whom was Mr. *Winter Hains* an Apothecary, and since Mayor of the City (and still alive,) who hath often said, that very instant he smelt the Design; The Officer with his Party was brought by *Henry Cowell*, Mr. *Tarranton*'s Servant, to the House of Mr. *Mitchel*,

Who then  
lived at *London*.

Nov. 9.

" *chel*, where finding the said *Tarranton*, the Officer told him, he was his  
 " Prisoner, and must go along with him to *Worcester*; and about Ten of the  
 " Clock the same day they all entered the City, where all the Trained-Bands  
 " of the County were up in Arms. The same day several other Persons  
 " were secured, as Mr. *Ambrose Sparry* Minister of *Marly*, (near which  
 " place the *Sham-Pacquet* was pretended to be found) Mr. *Henry Osland*  
 " Minister of *Bewdly*, Mr. *Edward Osland* of the *Rock*, Dr. *Jackson* of *Kid-*  
 " *derminster*, Mr. *Moor* Minister of *Worcester*, Mr. *Jarvis Brian* Minister  
 " of *Old-Swinford*, Capt. *Wells*, (living now at *Bednal-Green*) Mr. *Henry*  
 " *Baldwin*, Mr. *George Wilson*, Mr. *John Viscars* (now living in *Smithfield*)  
 " Mr. *Makine*, all four of *Worcester*, with some Scores more which I forbear  
 " to mention; all which Persons were disposed of into several Prisons or Pla-  
 " ces of Confinement, so that they could not speak one with another, having  
 " Sentinels always standing at their several Doors. Amongst the common  
 " People there was a great noise of a Horrid Plot, a Presbyterian Plot,  
 " and they were so confirmed in the belief of it, that the several Prisoners  
 " as they marched with their Guards through the Streets, were greatly re-  
 " viled and affronted.

" All things continued in this Posture for the space of Ten Days, after  
 " which time, the Trained Bands would continue no longer, they were  
 " grown a little sensible of the Sham; and upon their departure, the Deputy-  
 " Lieutenants (out of their great Clemency) Discharged all the Prisoners  
 " then in Custody, (except Dr. *Jackson*, Mr. *Sparry*, Mr. *Hen* and Mr. *Edw.*  
 " *Osland*, Capt. *Wells*, and Capt. *Tarranton*) only they must Pay their Fees,  
 " and find good Security not to go five Miles from their Habitations, without  
 " leave first obtained from the Lord-Lieutenant or two Deputy-Lieutenants,  
 " and to appear when they were sent for, and to keep all the King's Laws  
 " Ecclesiastical and Civil. This done, Mr. *Sparry*, Dr. *Jackson*, the two  
 " *Oslands*, and Capt. *Tarranton*, were ordered to be kept close Prisoners in  
 " several Chambers of the *George-Inn* in *Worcester*; so that no Person what-  
 " soever must come to speak with any of them but in the presence of the  
 " Marshal. The Trained-Bands being gone, as was said before, to their *Jo. Shuter*,  
 " several Homes, Care was taken for the Securing of these Criminals, by the Marshal.  
 " Dignified Clergy of *Worcester*, together with some of the fattest Clergy-  
 " men of the County, who provided about 60 Foot Soldiers which they  
 " Armed and Paid (as some of them said) with double Pay, who were to  
 " attend as Sentinels upon each of the Prisoners, and the rest to keep a Court  
 " of Guard at the Town-Hall of *Worcester*: These were commonly called the  
 " Clergy-Band; and had for their Captain one Mr. *William Sheldon* of  
 " *Stoke-Prior*, who hath of a long time (as it is said) belonged to the Rules  
 " in *Southwark*.

" I cannot omit acquainting you with one renowned Act of Chivalry that  
 " was done in this Church-Court-Guard; There came to *Worcester* a poor  
 " Old Man to enquire after the welfare of Mr. *Henry Osland* his Minister,



“and speaking with one of those Soldiers, the Soldier liberally charged  
 “Mr. Osland with being a Traitor, a Rebel, a Plotter against the Govern-  
 “ment, with some other hard Names; he stoutly defended his Minister, and  
 “said he was an honest peaceable Man, and he could never believe he was  
 “concerned in any Treason, or Plot against the Government; The Church-  
 “Militant-man in great Wrath laid hold of this poor old Zealot, and carried  
 “him to the Court of Guard: He that then presided in that Court Marshal  
 “was also a Church-Officer, and no meaner Man than an Apparitor; he  
 “commanded the Old Man to be tied Neck and Heels, charged him with  
 “having a hand in this Presbyterian Plot, and threatened him with severe  
 “Usage unless he would make a Confession: The Old Man bore all this  
 “with a great deal of Patience, answering him never a word; which so en-  
 “raged this Man in Authority, that he put lighted Matches betwixt his  
 “Fingers, and burnt them to the very Bone, and all to force from him a  
 “Confession of a Presbyterian Plot. The Name of the Person thus Tor-  
 “tured is *Roger Waldern of Bewdly*, who for ought I have heard to the con-  
 “trary is still alive, and carrieth about him the shrivelled Skin caused by  
 “those burning Matches, and so are many others alive that saw him in his  
 “Misery, and that contributed their help to the healing of his hands.

“This feigned Plot was not only laid in *Worcestershire*, but in other Shires  
 “and Counties of *England*, as I hinted before, I could fill many Sheets of  
 “Paper, if I pleased, with particulars; but give me leave to inform you  
 “only of some Passages in *Oxfordshire* with respect to this Plot, which fell  
 “out about the same time. There dwelt in *Oxford* one Mr. *Matthew Martin*,  
 “who was then Town-Clerk there, he is now a Brewer in *London*, and in  
 “good reputation both for Estate and Integrity; There came one Evening  
 “to his House in *Oxford*, a Stranger with a Letter, who had no sooner deli-  
 “vered it, but he withdrew and went his way, when Mr. *Martin* had  
 “opened it, and a little considered the Contents, he took a Prudent Course  
 “to carry it to the Mayor, as you’ll hear by and by, and to do it imme-  
 “diately; for had he tarried a Night, or an Hour, it might have been found  
 “about him, and *Oxford* had quickly been as full or fuller of Plotters and  
 “Prisoners than *Worcester*; The Copy of this Memorable Letter I here in-  
 “sert word for word.

In Old-Street,  
 London.

Mr. Martin,

I Pray you warn all these Men to be all in their Arms upon Wednesday next  
 in the Night, you know already where they must meet; there will come  
 to Oxford Two hundred Men all in their Arms, you know who doth Com-  
 mand them; Dr. Greenwood has sent to Mr. Combs the Barber to get his  
 Party of Scholars ready that Night; and I have sent to Mr. Hickman to get  
 his Men ready at the same time, and Dr. Owen has sent to Mr. Fogg to get  
 his Men ready at the same time; and Dr. Gawin has sent to Mr. Cornish to  
 get



get his Men ready at the same time, and I have sent to Dr. Connaught to get his Men ready, and all the Scholars are to meet in Dr. Rogers his Garden, I pray send the Blunderbusses thither, for I intend to be there my self, and I pray give the Bearer hereof five Pounds out of the Stock, and I pray remember me to the six Men unnamed; five Counties are to rise that Night without fail: I need write no more to you. The Word is, God is the Word, and pray tell them all so.

"In this Letter there was a List of the Persons Names he was to warn; For brevity, I omit the List  
 "the Mayor of Oxford presently dispatched a Messenger with an Account of these Transactions to the Lord Falkland, who was then a Member of of Names  
 "Parliament, and I think Lord Lieutenant of the County; and another Letter which Mr. Yarranton gives  
 "ter with the like Account was sent to the Recorder of Oxford, one of their us, p. 9. as also  
 "Members in Parliament; wherein they declare their Opinion that it was a the Mayor's  
 "Trick, many of the Persons mentioned being of known Fidelity to the King. Letter to the  
 "These Letters were shewed to one of the Secretaries of State, and thus this Lord Falkland, p. 10.  
 "pretty Project Miscarries in Oxford by the Providence of God and the at large.  
 "Prudent Management of the Discoverers, to the regret no doubt of those  
 "who had cunningly enough contrived it. I cannot learn that any further  
 "Progress was made in it, save only that two Deputy-Lieutenants sent next  
 "day for Mr. Martin, and threatned at first to commit him to Custody; but  
 "by and by they dismiss'd him with this Injunction, not to go out of the  
 "City within Fourteen days, without Special License; and that very Night  
 "came into the Town many of the Militia, who kept Guard for two days  
 "in the City.

"Tis high time now that I return to Worcester and give you an Account  
 "of the forementioned Plotters in close Confinement there. Dr. Jackson by  
 "the assistance of Sir R. C. gets his Enlargement. Mr. Sperry and one of the  
 "Oslands, moved that they might be Bailed or brought to Trial, but could  
 "obtain neither. Yarranton, and the other Osland, were altogether Passive  
 "and Silent, waiting to see what issue God in his Providence would put to  
 "these Arbitrary and Extrajudicial Proceedings, and it was not long ere they  
 "were strangely delivered; the manner was thus; On the Second of April Richard M.  
 "1662. the Person that was employed (as I have shewed you before) to  
 "carry the Pacquet of Sham Letters from Sir J. P. to one Cole of Marly,  
 "acquaints his Brother how he came by the said Pacquet; his Brother immediately upon this Discovery, repairs to Mrs. Yarranton and informs her  
 "of it; She went to Worcester, and prevails with the Marshal's Maid to deliver a Paper to her Husband wherein was a Relation of the whole Matter.  
 "This being done, Mr. Yarranton perused the Paper, and being thereby let into the knowledge of this Malicious Design, He ordered six Actions to be  
 "immediately Entred against some of those that brought him to Prison:  
 "And the next day being Saturday, in the time of high Market, he took  
 "two Bedstaves in his hands, and broke all the Windows in the Chamber  
 "U 2 "where

The George in  
the High-  
Street.

“ where he was Confined, and which look'd towards the Street; upon which  
“ the Town was in an Uproar, and a Multitude of People crowded before  
“ the Chamber in the broad Street to know what the matter was! He told  
“ them how he and others were maliciously and wrongfully Imprisoned; that  
“ he could give an Account of the Contrivance of this Plot, and who were  
“ the Contrivers of it.

“ On the *Wednesday* following, the Lord-Lieutenant and Six of his Deputies came to Town, and sent one *Fulk Fisher* (an Officer of theirs) to  
“ Mr. *Tarranton* to know the reason of his mis-behaving himself in the  
“ place of his Confinement: He sent them word, He did it on purpose that  
“ he might be brought the sooner before them, to make a Discovery of the  
“ Presbyterian Plot so much talk'd of, which he was ready and willing to  
“ do. After some debate between the Lord-Lieutenant and his Deputies  
“ about this Matter, it was at last resolved that *Tarranton* should be brought  
“ before them, which was done; There he offered to discover to them the  
“ whole Plot how it was laid, and by whom and for what Ends; he desired  
“ that the Doors might be set open, for he had many Friends and Witnesses  
“ without; He prayed also that he might have Pen, Ink and Paper, and he  
“ would write down the whole Matter; for words might be wrested to  
“ wrong intents: This was a while debated, but in reason it could not be  
“ denied, and Mr. *Tarranton* no sooner began to write, but the Lord-Lieutenant and Sir *John P.* left the Room, and went down the Back Stairs,  
“ and after followed the rest of the Deputy-Lieutenants, only Esq; *Bromely*  
“ of *Holt* staid behind. He it seems was no way Privy to this Design, and  
“ told Mr. *Tarranton*, he was Sorry with all his heart to see such things practised, to the disturbance of Honest Men, and the Honour of the Government.

“ The Enemy having thus fairly quitted the Field, Mr. *Tarranton* demanded of the Marshal, What he had further now to say to him? The Marshal  
“ only made it his Request, that he would not trouble him for holding him  
“ so long in Restraint, forasmuch as he was a Poor Man, and had many Children, and did only follow the Orders of his Superiours in what he had  
“ done. Mr. *Tarranton* told him, He did freely forgive him.

“ These dangerous Plotters being now at Liberty, they depart every Man  
“ to his own Home, and were never prosecuted or further questioned about  
“ this Matter: There was no need of that, for the Contrivers had now  
“ obtained their End, which was to possess the King and Parliament, that  
“ it was absolutely necessary to make some severe Act against this restless  
“ sort of Men, who not contented with the King's Gracious Pardon,  
“ were always Plotting to disturb the Government: Accordingly when the  
“ Parliament met together upon the 20th of *November 1661.* (to which  
“ time they were Adjourned) the King makes a Speech to them, wherein  
“ are these words:

My

My Lords and Gentlemen,

**I** Am Sorry to find that the General Temper and Affections of the Nation are not so well Composed as I hoped they would have been, after so signal Blessings of God Almighty upon us all, and after so great Indulgence and Condescensions from me towards all Interests; there are many wicked Instruments still as active as ever, who labour Night and Day to disturb the Publick Peace, and to make People jealous of each other; it may be worthy of your Care and Vigilance to provide proper Remedies for Diseases of that Kind, and if you find new Diseases, you must find new Remedies, &c.

"No sooner was this Parliament in their geers, but Sir J. P. one of the Knights for *Worcestershire*, with open mouth informs them of a dangerous Presbyterian Plot that was on foot; that many of the chief Conspirators were now in Prison at *Worcester*. The like Information was given by some of their Members that Served for *Oxfordshire, Herefordshire, Staffordshire*, and other places; yea, this was the general Vogue, as may appear by the Printed Pamphlets of those times. Hereupon a Bill of Uniformity was excogitated, and carried on in the Parliament, and passed that Sessions.

Note, this was before the Sham was discovered to Mr. Tarranton.

Some say, but by a very few Votes.

"I have done with the First Part of this Sham Plot, when I have added a Passage or two more concerning Mr. Tarranton; As soon as he was Discharged (as before) he goes up to *London*, and prevails with the Lord of *Bristol* to acquaint the King with the great wrong he had received, and with the wicked Contrivance of some of his Ministers by Sham-Plots to divide the King from his People, and his People from one another: Hereupon an Order of Council was directed to the Deputy-Lieutenants of *Worcestershire* that were then in and about *London*, to appear before the Council, and to give an Account of this Matter. They seemed to clear themselves from being concerned therein, and desired such as were in the Country might be consulted: The next Post they inform their Brethren in the Country how Matters stood before the Council, and that the Lord of *Bristol* did Patronize Mr. Tarranton; upon this Sir J. W. one of the Deputy-Lieutenants, hastens up to *London*, and brings with him one *Hales* an Attorney, his Kinsman and Tenant, (now living in *Tenbury*) which *Hales*, with a Constable of *St. Mary Overies*, and one *Halborn* a Waterman (now living in *Pepper-Alley* in *Southwark*) Arrested Mr. Tarranton (when he was Bowling in *Winchester-Park*) for High Treason; and being further assisted by some of the Horse-Guards then in *Southwark*, conveyed him in *Halborn's* Boat to *White-Hall*, where he was that Night in Custody; but on the Morrow, the Earl of *Bristol* sent the King's Privy Seal to a Friend of Mr. Tarranton's, who brought it to him, wherein it was declared, That it was the King's Pleasure, he should Tra-

"vel

"vel where he pleased, and not to be molested by any Person whatsoever, without a Special Warrant from the King.

"Mr. *Tarranton* seeing how Matters went in *London*, resolved to return again into the Country; where he prosecuted Major *Wild* and others, for Imprisoning of him wrongfully; but within Six Months after, a Design is laid by some of the Criminals in the former Sham-Plot, to Suborn Persons to Swear against him, that he had spoken Treasonable Words against the King and the Government; the Witnesses were, one *Dainy* (a Mountebank, formerly an Apothecary in *Derby*) who afterwards acknowledged that he had Five Pounds for his Pains; The other Witness lived in *Wales* and went by two Names; this was done at the Assizes in *Worcester*, the Bill being found by the Grand Jury, Mr. *Tarranton* put himself upon his Trial, and though he did not except against any one of his Jury, yet upon a full Hearing of the Case, they presently acquitted him, to the great disappointment of the designing Gentlemen.

*Twissden*, then Judge.

This Narrative Mr. *Tarranton* Published under his own Hand, and I never could understand that any Answer was made to it; and by mentioning the Names of Persons then living, and therein appealing to them, it appears to be of undoubted credit; and if any shall take upon them to contradict it, there are so many of the Persons concerned still alive, as are sufficient to make out the truth and certainty of it.

Some of the Ejected Ministers had been Sufferers for the King, as Mr. *Cook*, Mr. *Harrison*, Mr. *Kirby*, Mr. *Siddan*, sent up Prisoners about Sir *Geo. Booth's* Attempt. Collection of Debates, p. 212.

This Act of Uniformity which was gained by such an Infamous Stratagem, obliged all Ministers to Subscribe to the Book of Common-Prayer by *Bartolomew-Day*, upon pain of Deprivation *ab officio & beneficio*, which about Two thousand Ministers could not do, and were accordingly ejected; and it is a wonder that all the Ministers in *England* were not Silenced by it; for it is a known and certain Truth, that the Liturgy with its new Alterations to which they assented, came not out of the Press till about *Bartolomew-Eve*; so that all those that Conformed, excepting perhaps one or two in *London*, Subscribed to they knew not what; and thus the Effects of that Edict, were as scandalous as the cause and rise of it. An honourable Member of the House of Commons observed in Parliament in the Year 1680. If the Laws against Dissenters were projected in favour of the Protestant Religion, it is strange they were so promoted (as many Members now here, that Served in that Parliament do remember) by Sir *Thomas Clifford*, Sir *Solomon Swale* and Sir *Roger Strickland*, who have all since appeared to be Papists.

When the lamentable Effects of this Act began to appear more visible every day than other, and the King was sensible how they had been cheated into it, by a pretended Plot, the Forgery whereof was now discovered; He set forth the very same Year *Decem. 26.* his Declaration of Indulgence, and in *February* next when the Parliament was met, in his Speech to both Houses, told them, He was willing to set bounds to the Hopes of some, and the Fears of others; that in his own Nature he was an Enemy to all Severity for Religion and Conscience, how mistaken soever it be, and wish'd he had a Power of Indulgence to use upon such Occasions.

Journal of the House of Lords, Dec. 18. Feb. 1662.

The

The House of Lords ordered a Bill to be brought in to enable the King to grant Licences to such of His Majesties Subjects of the Protestant Religion, of whose inoffensive and peaceable Disposition His Majesty should be persuaded, to enjoy and use the Exercise of their Religion and Worship, though differing from the Publick Rule; but the House of Commons when it came before them divided upon it, No's 161, Yea's 119. and so it was rejected, and greater Severity used than before.

*Ibid.*  
*Die Veneris*  
*13. die Martii.*  
*Commons*  
*Journal,*  
*Die Mercur.*  
*25. die Feb.*  
*15 Car. 2.*

In the Year 1665. That dreadful Plague in London drove a great many Ministers out of the City, and left open a Door for some Nonconformists to Preach in their Pulpits; and Men being a little startled and their Spirits softened by that Stupendious Judgment of God, there was a Connivance, and Private Meetings were set up and multiplied greatly.

In the Year 1667. The King in his Speech to both Houses of Parliament *Die Lunæ, 10 die Febr.* thus express'd himself— "One thing more I hold my self obliged to recommend unto you at this present; which is, That you would seriously think of some Course to beget a better Union and Composure in the Minds of my Protestant Subjects in Matters of Religion, whereby they may be induced not only to submit quietly to the Government, but also cheerfully give their Assistance to the Support of it. But there was nothing done at that time towards it.

In 1672. The King again gives Liberty of Conscience, upon what design, Conjectures were various; many believed it to be in favour of Popery, but others said the Papists had as much Liberty before, being generally winked at, and the Penal Laws wholly turn'd upon Protestant Dissenters; However the House of Commons took notice of it, and would not allow the King any Power to Dispense with the Laws, and yet were grown so sensible of the Hardships put upon Dissenting Protestants, that a Bill was brought in, in favour of them and passed the House, and was sent up to the House of Lords, and it is verily believed had passed them too, but for want of time.

In 1675. The Parliament met again, in which the Church and Court Party laid aside their Zeal against Popery, and all the Cry was against Dissenters; and a Bill that was Voted in the former Session, for Marrying our Princes only to Protestants, was carried in the Negative by the Unanimous Vote of the Bishops Bench and rejected; And a Test brought in, requiring all Officers in Church and State, and all Members of both Houses to take this following Oath.

*I A. B. do Declare, That it is not Lawful upon any Pretence whatsoever, to take up Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that Traiterous Position of taking up Arms by his Authority against his Commission, or against those that are Commissioned by him in pursuance of such a Commission. And I do Swear, that I will not at any time endeavour the Alteration of the Government either in Church or State.*



The learned and weighty Reasons that were brought against this Bill by the Country Lords (as they were then distinguished from those of the Court and Church) we have published by one of the protesting Peers in the same Year. This lasted five days, before it was committed to a Committee of the whole House; They Pleaded against it as a Breach of the Privilege of Peerage, that it was in Effect to establish a Standing Army by Act of Parliament, That if whatever is done by the King's Commission may not be opposed, by his Authority, then a Standing Army is Law when ever the King pleases; That it struck at the very Root of our Constitution, obliging every Man to Abjure all Endeavours to alter the Government in the Church, without regard to any thing that Rules of Prudence in the Government, or Christian Compassion to Dissenters, or the Necessity of Affairs at any time may require. The Names of those Noble Peers that with so much hazard to their own Persons endeavoured to stem that impetuous torrent, are,

Buckingham,	Bedford,	Hallifax,	Clarendon,	Bristol,
Bridgewater,	Dorset,	Howard,	Grey-Roll,	Aylesbury,
Winchester,	Denbigh,	Mobun,	Say & Seal,	Audley,
Salisbury,	Pagest,	Stamford,	Wharton,	Fitzwater.

But all was in vain, for (says our Honourable Author) the Earl of Winchelsea put an End to the Debate, and the Major Vote *Ultima ratio Senatum & Conciliorum* carried the Question as the Court and Bishops would have it, and all they could do was to enter their Protests against it, and were menaced for so doing.

And thus with Wind and Tide our Church-men bore down furiously upon the Dissenters, and all that durst but seem favourable to them, for two or three Years together, till the Popish Plot broke out in 1678. which gave such an Alarm to the Nation, as reduced some Men to their Wits, and others to their Wits-end; Now the Humour was diverted another way, and a year or two spent in searching into the depth of the Design, and while some zealous Protestants were diligently employed in tracing out the Plot; others that called themselves by the same Name, were as busie by their Counter-mines and Counter-paces to spoil the track and make it undiscernable.

In the mean while the Dissenters were pretty easie, the Meetings encreased and were greatly frequented; And there being now a Parliament of true Englishmen, they ordered a Bill to be brought into the House of Commons for the Uniting of Protestants, and in their Journals we have this Resolve, *That it is the Opinion of this House, that the Prosecution of Dissenters upon the Penal Laws, is at this time grievous to the Subject, a weakening of the Protestant Interest, an Encouragement to Popery, and Dangerous to the Peace of this Kingdom.*

But as the Plot died, Persecution revived; New Sham-plots were forged and fastened upon Presbyterians: Then was our Land stained with the No-  
blest

blest and most Innocent Blood of *Essen, Russel, Sidney, &c.* whose invaluable Lives were sacrificed to the Lusts of Papists and Tories, whilst Ecclesiasticks sung *Te Deum*, and the injured Nation durst scarcely be seen to lament their fall.

When the Duke of *York* arrived at the Crown, the Stream of Persecution was very strong and violent, and all men thought the unhappy attempt of the Duke of *Monmouth*, would have made it rage more furiously when almost all the Gentlemen in *England* that were counted Whiggs were under Confinement; but not long after a Declaration was set forth for a General Liberty of Conscience; I am sure it was unexpected by the generality of Dissenters; it found some of them in Prison, and like a good Angel made their fetters fall off, and the doors fly open; others were forced to abscond from their Families, and Employments, for fear of the Excommunication Writ, and these it rescued from impending ruin; and indeed it found them all insulted over, scorned and trampled upon by the Bigots of the other Party, but this Declaration put a respect upon them, and gave them the Opportunity of letting the World see they were neither so few, nor so bad, nor contemptible as their Adversaries had represented them.

There are two things for which Dissenters are frequently reproached in the late Reign. *First*, Their accepting that Liberty with such Addresses of Thanks. *Secondly*, Their writing so few Books against Popery; I have something to say in their just Defence upon both Accounts.

As to the *First*, It had been the greatest Madness in the World for them, to have refused the Advantages of that Liberty; they thought themselves obliged to Worship God according to the Dictates of their Conscience, when they run the Risque of Prison, and Banishment for so doing; and to neglect it, when they were freed from those hazards, would have been such a piece of sullen unaccountable perverseness, as these Gentlemen would soon have upbraided us with. I know it is commonly said, that Toleration was promoted in favour of the Papists, and I believe few of the Dissenters ever questioned it; but they knew very well, that when it was granted, for them to have sat still, and suffer'd the Papists alone to enjoy the Benefits of it, would have strengthened Popery much more; the Papists would have had never the less Liberty, though Dissenters had been silent, and when they were let loose, it was time for all hands to be at work, to countermine them, and there's no better weapon to subdue Error, than the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.

It is objected, this Declaration was founded upon a Dispensing Power and so accept of it was owning such a Power; But the Dissenters never by Word or Writing ascribed any such Power unto the King as to Dispense with the Laws, that are for the good of the Nation; indeed they always esteemed the Laws by which they were excluded to be very unjust and unreasonable Edicts, contrary to the Law of God, and the common Interest, and that they ought not to have been made, or ever executed when they were made, they never thought them binding in Point of Conscience, and though they were forced heretofore to submit to the Penalty, yet they were not so forsaken of common Sense, as to court the Continuance of that Penalty, or cast themselves into Prison, when the Magistrate did not think fit to do it.

But the Clergy of the Church of *England* had often in the Pulpit, and from the Press told the King that he had such a Power, as the Author of *Vox Cleri pro Rege*, shews us in abundance of Instances. And the Judges who were of the Church of *England*, had given it for Law, as the other had declared it for Gospel; and all the Magistrates in *England* thought fit to acquiesce in it, which surely they would not have done, if they had not thought it a just and reasonable thing; for indeed the Kings Declaration would have signified little, if the Magistrates had put the Laws in Execution still; and if they did not think those Laws were really suspended, they were bound by their Oaths to have done it, and their forbearance was a plain acknowledgment of such a Power at least, as to such kind of Laws, as were hereby suspended, but the Dissenters, only persistered to do that which they thought themselves obliged to (as they had opportunity) by the Law of God, any thing in humane Laws to the Contrary notwithstanding.

E. of W's  
Speech.

And as to their Addresses of Thanks, it least becomes the Churchmen of all others to Reflect upon them, not only because it was their Cruelty that made Indulgence so very pleasant, and Oppression sometimes makes a wise man mad, but also because they fall vastly short of those high flights of Complement, which these men themselves took in their Addresses of a far worse Nature and Occasion. If it be so Criminal to Thank the King, for not suffering Protestants to destroy one another, what shall we say of those that in the most Luxuriant manner, thank'd him for dissolving one of the best of Parliaments, and as a Noble Peer lately told them, "Were so forward in the Surrender of Charters, and their fulsome Addresses and Abhorrences, making no other claim to their Liberties "and Civil Rights but Concessions from the Crown, telling the King every one "of his Commands was stamp'd with Gods Authority, &c. Besides, I am informed by one of those that joined in an Address of Thanks to the King in *Cheshire*, that the Nonconformists never moved in it till the Churchmen had led them the way; these Gentleman therefore are too Imprudent to provoke us to Recriminations that will be so vastly to their own dishonour; I am sure the Dissenters thank'd the Late King for nothing, but what our present King and Parliament have Confirmed to them, as the likeliest way to unite Protestants in Interest and Affection, as the Preamble of the Act speaks; and if there was any thing in that Liberty that was serviceable to the Papists, it must be in the manner of giving it, not in the thing it self, as far as we are concerned in it; and if the Episcopal Party had been so wise as to have promoted a legal Comprehension when it was in their Power they had disabled the Papists from serving themselves of any Liberty of ours.

As to the Second, That Dissenters writ so little against Popery in the Late Reign, it may be very easily accounted for.

They have sufficiently demonstrated their Abhorrence of Popery at all times, and their Leading Men, as Mr. Baxter, Mr. Posh, and the Preachers of the Morning Lecture, have acquitted themselves very well in the Confutation of it; and Malice it self cannot really believe that they are in the least favourable to the

the Romish Heresie, the Crime that has been generally objected against them, has been their too great averfation and distance from it.

As for the late Discourses upon that Subject, that are so much boasted of, it is observable that most of them were begun upon Personal Engagements, as one of the Principal Managers thereof acknowledges; *There is (says he) a Train in Controversies as well as in Thoughts, one thing still giving start to another, Conferences produce Letters, Letters, Books, and one discourse gives occasion for another, &c.* Now in such Cases it would not been have decent, for a Third Person to have stept in and invaded another mans Province.

The Preface to the Exam. of the Council of Trent by Catholick Tradition.

Besides there was no manner of Necessity for it, the Papists in England have been a baffled party for some Ages, and their Errors so often exposed that it was too easie a Task these Gentlemen were engaged in, to require so much help, it's a beaten Road in which they were to Travel; and as I do not find that the Papists offered any thing of late, but what has been in substance answered a thousand times, so it was not necessary for our Doctors, to set their Wits on the Rack for a Reply, nor indeed do I perceive any thing, Method and Language excepted, that pretends to be new; nor is this any Diminution of their Honour, but a Peace of Justice to the Memory, and worth of those that have gone before them.

And I might add, the Presbyterians had little Reason to fear that any of their Persuasion would be perverted, their distinguishing Principle of the sufficiency of the Scripture, will infallibly secure them, whilst they adhere unto it; But many of our Churchmen had instill'd into their Followers very odd Notions concerning the Power of the Church in Matters of Faith, (as in the twenty Article) and of the Apostolical Succession and Authority of Bishops, and their Power of Judging what is fit and decent in the Worship of God to which all others must submit; and concerning the binding force of old Canons and Councils; and such Doctrines as these would be in danger to betray men into the Arms of that Church, that can pretend as high in these matters as any; and it is certain in Fact some of their Bishops and Doctors and Clergy fell in with them, and it was time for them to bestir themselves, to deliver their men out of the Snarcs which they had helped to lay for them.

Faller C. H. l. 9. p. 74. This clause was left out of the Art. in 1571, but A. B. Lead, would have it inserted again. Parker, Cartwright, Walker, Boys, Farmer, Slater, Massey, Goodall, &c.

And the Dissenters were very well pleased to see those Learned Men baffling the Papists, upon such Principles, as they had reason to hope, would set the Authors themselves more upright, than before some of them had been; those that read Dr. Sherlocks Preservatives against Popery, and what he there says concerning the Nature of Gospel Worship, *That God will not now have a Temple, nor a his Presence appropriated to any place, and the like*, and compare it with that he has formerly writ, especially in that Book wherein he told us, *that Christianity is nothing else but Mystical Judaism*, will find that his late Polemical Engagements, were so very beneficial to himself that it had been a thousand pities, to have taken the work out of his Hands; And what I have collected out of these Modern debates concerning Church-Unity, Communion, Succession, &c. may convince any man that we had all the reason in the World, to

Vind. Defence of Dr. S. p. 13.



make them fair way and room, when they were got into the good old Road of Scripture Catholick Notions, that would infallibly confound the Papists and when they had done that, would very much contribute to the reconciling of Protestants amongst themselves.

The Author of the Review takes upon him to affirm, that *none of our Ministers, endeavoured at that time to fortify his Conventicle against Popish Delusions*, but how can he expect to be believed in that, which 'tis as impossible for him to know, as to be an Ubiquitarian, and in all the Conventicles in *England* at the same time, and as he can never prove it to be true; so there are thousands in *England* know it to be false, and are able to testifie, that notwithstanding their Obligations to the Government, their Ministers never failed, to confute Popish Tenets, when they fell in their way, and that not seldom they would go a step or two out of their way to meet them.

As unhappy is he, in the little stories that follow, *Dr. Owen was in Fee with King James*, and yet was dead, several years before; *Our present Patrons were the men picks up at Court to compleat our Ruine*; and yet I know of no Patrons we have for our Liberty, but the King, Lords and Commons, I hope he does not mean them. We know very well what Bishops and others were of the Ecclesiastical Commission, in the Bishop of *London's* Case, and in that of *Cambridge* and *Maudlin Colledge in Oxford*; not one Presbyterian amongst them. Let this Gentleman prove, that any Ministers of ours assisted at Jesuitical Intreagues, or had Money sprinkled amongst them to carry on those designs and by my Consent, whoever is found Guilty shall be his Bondslave, but by no means let Confidence, and Noise, and loud Appeals be taken for Evidence against them.

Amongst all that Croud of Writers, that give us the History of the late Revolution, there is scarcely one of them, but acknowledges that the Dissenters, were aware of the Popish design of taking away the Test, and would not consent to it; though for the Penal Laws, they thought many of them might be very well spared; and I challenge him to prove that either *Mr. Lab* or any other Person amongst those called Presbyterian and Congregational (and we have nothing to do with others) ever advised *King James* to any thing, but what our Present King and Parliament, have thought fit to establish by Law.

Review, p.  
33-

If (as this Gentleman tells us) a little Money, and a Toleration will make the Dissenters so easie and quiet, and well satisfied; it is a sign they are not the worst tempered People in the World; and it were well if our Churchmen were as easly pleased, for what my Lord *Falkland* (a great Royalist) said of some of the Bishops in 1641, they were so cordially Papists, that it was all that fifteen hundred Pounds a Year could do to keep from Confessing it; I am afraid is too true concerning many of our Clergy in another respect, it is as much as some hundreds a year can do to keep them Quiet, and Content under the present Government.

However we are obliged to him for telling us, what the sober thinking People judge of us, it seems, *They do not stick to say, that our Zeal against Popery*



is all Counterfeit, that we would be better Conformists if Popery should prevail than we are now ; but he should have told us, who these sober thinking People are, so many will presume to dignify themselves with those Epithets, that have as little right to 'em, as any People in the World ; and it is usual enough, for a Mob of Ecclesiastical Politicks to get together, and when they are well heated with drinking Healths to the Church of England, and have liberally Cursed and Damned the Dissenters, then step forth, and look big, and think themselves capable of reporting the opinion of all the sober thinking men of the Nation ; and I am the more inclin'd to believe that it is a Cabal of such men as these, that have chosen this Gentleman for their Speaker, because our own experience assures us, those Conformists that are really most sober, have always express'd far different Sentiments concerning us, and we hope we shall never do any thing to forfeit their Friendly respect, but be always as ready to return, as receive it.

See the Review. *Ibid.*

I must not omit, what this Gentleman has replied to the Vindicator concerning the Penal Laws, as they have been executed upon Protestant Dissenters ; He pretends, they reclaimed many, and did a great deal towards bringing English Protestants to Uniformity, it was well he did not say to Unity, for that had been one of the grossest Fallacies in the World ; And I will not deny but that many Dissenters went to Church, when they had no where else to go, their Ministers being some in Prison, others beyond Sea, and many not daring to shew their Heads, and perhaps some of them were forced, by those severe Proceedings to comply further than their Consciences could well allow, and such kind of Conversions the French Dragoons may boast of too, but it is nevertheless certain that these things tend to alienate the Minds of Men one from another, and the present numbers of Dissenters, may convince him such Methods will never effect a general Unity ; and it was some years ago observed in Parliament, by an Honourable Person, " That neither the Oxford Act, nor that of the thirty fifth of the Queen, nor any other had ever been executed in favour of the Church, that Dissenters were as many if not more than ever. 1680. Coll. of Debates. p. 211.

And the present Bishop of Worcester, will tell this Gentleman, " That discipline and too great stiffness of behaviour towards Dissenters, have made some of them more their Enemies than they would have been ; That Persecution was a Popular Argument for them, the Complaining side having always the most pity, but now that is taken off ( says he ) you may deal with them upon more equal Terms ; Some think Severity makes men consider, I am afraid it heats them too much, and makes them too violent and refractory. Charge in his Primary Visitation, p. 25, 26.

That this Gentleman may see, that not the Vindicator only, but the most eminent Fathers of the Church of England condemn the Severities that have been used towards Protestant Dissenters, and how unbecoming as well as imprudent a thing it is in him to justify them, I shall leave their own Words to his Consideration.

The present Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, who Honours the Metropolitan See, more than he can be honoured by it, in a Fast Sermon before the Queen, speaking of the Clergy expresses himself thus. " And it can never be sufficiently la- Sept. 18. 1691.

" mented,

mented, no though it were with Tears of Blood, that we whose particular Charge and Imployment it is to build up the Souls of men in a Holy Faith, and in the Resolution of a good Life, should for want of due Instruction, and by the Dissolute and Profligate Lives of too many amongst us, and by inflaming our needless differences about lesser things, have so great a hand in the pulling down Religion and in betraying the Souls of men, &c.

The Bishop of Worcester, in his *Visiations Charges* acknowledges that the Persecution of Dissenters, was promoted by the Papists, his Words are; "I hope they are now convinced, that the Persecution which they complained lately so much of, was carried on by other men and for other designs than they would then seem to believe. Indeed we always thought the Papists had the chief hand in it, and we are glad, others begin to see it.

P. 4.

None has spoke more freely to this matter than the Bishop of Sarum, in his Observations upon *Ridleys* Letter to *Hooper*, he puts this Objection. "But when the Clergy of the Church of England, saw that good and great Men and the glorious Martyrs of Jesus Christ, such as *Hooper* was, were offended with these Ceremonies, they should have used their utmost endeavours, to have gotten them discharged by Law, as they were impos'd by Law; and not have left them to remain, as a standing offence, and a perpetual stumbling block to all others of *Hoopers* mind.

Now to this he Answers: "This I confess would be an Objection very much to the Prejudice of the Church of England, could it not be truly said, that the Clergy did heartily endeavour to procure this ease to scrupulous Consciences, though without success, for all the eminent Bishops of England in Queen *Elizabeths* time did labour in this Point, and could not prevail with the Queen to Consent to it. And a little further blaming the Nonconformists, for crying out so much of Persecution, excuses it thus. "If any man take my right hand, and therewith bruise and batter my left hand; is my right hand therefore become a Persecutor? Is it not really persecuted as well as the other? and has it not a fellow-feeling and share of the Misery?

P. 27.

And in his Exhortation to Peace and Union, "God be thanked for it that there is an End put to all Persecution in matters of Religion, and that the first and chief right of Humane Nature, of following the dictates of Conscience in the Service of God is secured to all men amongst us, and that we are freed I hope for ever, of all the Remnants of the worst part of Popery, I mean the Spirit of Persecution.

The Seven Bishops in their Petition to the late King, declared they would not be wanting in due Tenderness to Dissenters, but willingly come to such a temper as should be thought fit when the matter should come to be considered and settled in Parliament and Convocation; and about the time of the P. of Orange's Landing, all their discourse was of Union & Comprehension; inasmuch as that a Reverend Prelate told a dissenting Minister, *He need never so fear Persecution from the Church of England again;* adding, *If any such thing should ever happen, let me be accounted a false Prophet.* I hope these Gentlemen will not give us occasion to say

say

say as *Demades* the Orator was wont to say of the *Armenians*, That they never came to consult of Peace (*nisi atrati*) but in Mourning under some Publick Calamity or Danger.

Our gracious Sovereign, when P. of *Orange*, in his Declaration, promised to endeavour a good Agreement between the Church of *England* and all Protestant Dissenters, and to cover and secure all those who would live peaceably under the Government, from all persecution upon the account of their Religion, and has all along strictly adhered to that Royal Promise and Design; and in pursuance thereof, encircled with his Lords and Commons in Parliament, has given us our present Indulgence, as that which the Wisdom of the Nation judged the likeliest way to Unite us all in Interest and Affection; and I hope the Sentiments of all these will more than ballance what our Gentleman has offered to Vindicate the Execution of the Penal Laws, and he must be a man of more than ordinary assurance, that durst take upon him to oppose his private peevish opinion to such an august and venerable Determination.

This Gent. as well as *T. W.* threatens the Vindicator, with I know not what rebukes from the Government, for reflecting upon the Doctrines of Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience; but this is a Subject that has been so thoroughly canvass'd of late, and the Folly of those Opinions (in the sense they have been advanced) laid open, that he needs not any one should defend him therein.

The Honourable Sir *Robert Howard* in his Defence of Mr. *Johnson's* Answer to *Jovian*, takes notice of the something objected against him; His Adversary had said, *I know not how these Arguments against Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience can make for their Majesties Service, and the honour of the Reformation it is possible the Noble Author doth.*

To which Sir *Robert* Answers, "I think I do, and shall endeavour to demonstrate it; But first give me leave to be a little surprized that Dr. *Hicks* or his Friend, should be concerned for His Majesty's Service, or the Safety and Honour of a Government which Dr. *Hicks* renounces: And though it seems he could not with a safe Conscience officiate in his Calling under an unlawful Power, made so by virtue of the Doctrine of Passive Obedience; yet, he says, he understands not how the Opposition to this Doctrine can be for the Service of the Government; this is a strange Riddle that the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, made Dr. *Hicks* against the Government, and yet he understands not how the Opposition to that Government can be for the Service of it.—I shall readily confess that the Principles I assert are for the Safety of one of Dr. *Hicks's* his complicated Tyrants, but they may be for a good Prince that opposeth Tyranny. It was against these Principles (of Passive Obedience) that the Nation implored and obtained Relief, and according to their Original Right fixt the Crown upon their Reliever's Head—Then he gives an Excellent Account of the present Government and Rights of the Subject; and concludes, "I hope by this Account, I have shewed my Adversary, that the Safety and Honour of this Government was procured and founded against his Principles of Passive Obedience, which had they been as Sacredly observed as he would have

" have them, our Redemption had never been effected, and perhaps he had been  
 " better pleased— 'tis thus true Understanding and undivided Interest of the  
 " King and People that must Secure and Preserve the Honour and Safety of the  
 " Government, and the shaking of both must proceed from the Temptation  
 " and Apprehension that Passive Obedience and the Imperial Law must insure  
 " into the King and People.

These two Pamphleteers would gladly possess the Minds of our Governours  
 with Indignation against the Vindicator, because he made bold to reflect upon  
 the Miscarriages of our former Princes; when the Citizen forced him to say  
 what he did in defence of himself and his Friends, whom the other had abused by  
 falsely reporting Matters of Fact; for my part, I take no delight in disturbing  
 the Ashes of the Dead, much less those of Princes, but when such kind of Men as  
 these have ruined them by their Flatteries and insatuated Counsels, and would  
 then cast the Odium of all upon those that are Innocent, it becomes absolutely  
 necessary to declare the Naked Truth, let it fall where it will.

Works of  
 the Learned,  
 p. 206.  
 1692.

And as our Present illustrious Princes are too Just and Righteous in every  
 thing to fear any future Reflections, so they are too Wise and Generous to be in-  
 censed against those that lay open the Faults of such as have gone before, the re-  
 membrance whereof is an excellent folly, to set off the unspotted brightness of  
 their own Administrations; and it is a remarkable Passage which *De la Croix*  
 gives us in his Abstracts, and fit to be here inserted, *viz.* " I remember a wise  
 " Saying of her Present Majesty, which I was told four or five Years ago by a  
 " Reverend Divine who was then present; Some would have incensed her Royal  
 " Highness against that famous French Minister Monsieur *Jurieu*, who in his  
 " Answer to Father *Maimbourg*, that he might the better justify the Reforma-  
 " tion in *Scotland*, made a very black representation of their Queen *Mary*. Is  
 " it not a shame, said one of the Company, that this Man without any Consi-  
 " deration for your Royal Person, should dare to throw such infamous Calum-  
 " nies upon a Queen from whom your Royal Highness is Descended? No, not  
 " at all, replied the Ingenious Princess; for is it not enough, that by such  
 " Praises Kings be lulled asleep all their lives; But must Flattery accompany  
 " them to their very Graves? How then should Princes fear the Judgment of  
 " Posterity, if Historians were not allowed to speak the Truth after their Death?

We can never thank God sufficiently, for giving us Rulers that love plain  
 dealing, and scorn to be flattered; and were it not so, the truth might be smothered,  
 and the Nation imposed upon by these Men, as it has been heretofore;  
 they must not expect that our Princes will so undervalue themselves as to be the  
 Executioners of every little Menace of their own; the Royal Lion will not  
 devour all that the waspish Jackalls have mark'd out for a Prey: If one party  
 Accuse, the other shall have liberty to make their Defence; though it would be  
 most pleasing to our Superiours, that there might be a mutual forbearance and  
 agreement on both Sides.



A  
D E F E N C E  
OF  
Mr. M. H's Brief ENQUIRY  
INTO THE  
N A T U R E  
OF  
S C H I S M

And the Vindication of it.

WITH  
R E F L E C T I O N S  
Upon a Pamphlet called  
The Review, &c.

And a Brief Historical Account of Nonconformity from the Reformation to this Present Time.

L O N D O N,

Printed by T. S. for Tho. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns,  
at the Lower End of Cheapside near Mercers Chappel, 1693.



THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTEN LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

RECEIVED

APR 10 1902

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

DEPT. OF EDUCATION

RECEIVED

APR 10 1902

---

# THE PREFACE.

**I** Expect to hear from all Sides, that such Controversies as these, at this time a day, are very inopportune and ill advised; I confess we have as much reason to value our present Ease and Quiet as any People in the World, and to avoid every thing that may disturb or endanger it: And we have not so abandon'd the Principles of Self-preservation, as willingly to expose our selves to repeated Severities.

And if I had not some Cause to believe that our silent disregard of the Abuses put upon us, will be made (by Innuendo's) a Confession of Guilt, and will harden and encourage our Adversaries against us, I would have took no notice of the Citizen's Reply, but have left him and his Learned Cabal, to the sweet Delights of a fancied Conquest.

I know we may safely appeal, from his sordid Calumnies, to the juster Sentiments of the soberest and wisest of the Episcopal Persuasion, who have been full as severe in the Censure of his Pamphlets, as is necessary for us to be; but I am also assured, there are too many in this emancipated Age, that are passionately fond of any thing that throws dirt upon Dissenters, and true or false, sence or nonsense, it is all one to them; whose insatiable Lusts have left them neither Time nor Capacity to search into the true state and merits of the Cause.

I wonder upon what Inducement, this Gentleman should take upon him to quarrel with Mr. H's Enquiry, unless it were that he might make himself the Favourite of such a Generation of Men; or that his Ghostly Fathers had obliged him to do Penance in those Sheets; I know not what could have been writ, more fair and inoffensive, than that Book; Schism was the Word, that had animated Men with a strange, Blind Zeal, against all those upon whom their Leading Men had fixed the mark; and it was given out with so much Industry, as if it had been the Shibboleth of the Party, reserved for some special Service against a convenient Season.

*Mr. H. kindly endeavoured to undeceive them, and by enquiring into the Quality of those Actions, upon which this Sin is charged in Scripture to discover its true formal Nature, that Men might not fight in the dark, and build vast and endless Controversies upon a single Word, and that too not rightly understood.*

He observes that the word *Schism* is not us'd in Scripture in any sense applicable to the present Case, save only three times in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, those places he has particularly examined. He shews that those *Schismatical* Corinthians met in the same place still, but contending with one another, about some lesser matters to the breach of Christian Love, and Mutual Alienation of their Affections, fell into the Sin there called *Schism*; concluding from hence, that the formal Nature of this Sin consists not in Separation of Communion, but in the Violation of that Love and Charity there ought to be amongst Christians; Acknowledging nevertheless, that many Overt Actions may be, and are *Schismatical*, as they proceed from this *Uncharitableness*; and he mentions such as these, Judging and Condemning one another about the Circumstantial of Religion; reproaching and reviling each other; making, approving, and executing Penal Laws about such things; and Separation from Communion with those we have join'd our selves to without cause; that is, (as he explains it) without regard had to any thing amiss in the Church we separate from, or any thing better in that we join our selves to, which he calls Separation for Separation's sake; This is *Schism*, not barely because Separation, but because animated by that *Uncharitableness* and *Disaffection*, which in Scripture is known by the Name of *Schism*.

The Gentleman, could not digest a Notion so far different from what he had imbib'd; but tells us, Mr. H's Book had not much more of *Schism* than of the Philosopher's Stone in it: He was loth so heavy a Charge should lye against *Uncharitableness*, which being a main Ingredient in his own Constitution, must be more softly and tenderly handled, he thinks it more Prudent to lay the Fault so, as he may bear the least share of it himself; and therefore boldly affirms, that Diversity of Communion is the Ratio formalis of *Schism*; and more than that, says he, has proved it to be so.

The Author of the Vindication justly blam'd him, for so rash and confident an Assertion, as giving the Lye to the Word of God, which Charges the Corinthians with the Guilt of *Schism*, when there was no such Diversity of Communion; and can there be a *Schism* where that is wanting, which he calls the true formal Nature of *Schism*? Can a thing exist without its Essential Form? To this, the Gentleman replies, "Shall a Cut in the Arm be truly *Schism*, and not the separating the Arm from the Body? If Paul condemn'd the Corinthians of *Schism*, for preferring one Minister before another, Shall that far greater Crime of separa-

Enquiry, p. 9.

Reply, p. 2.

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 10.

## The Preface.

separating from them, be excluded from Schism? This Gentleman is a topping Answerer.

But we cannot Complement this Gentleman so far as to call him a Topping Defendant; For the Question was not, Whether there may not be a Separation that is really Schismatical, Mr. H. granted that; But whether Separation be the very Essence and formal Nature of Schism? If so, then there can be no Schism without such Separation; which is false, as in the Case of the Corinthians; nor any Separation without Schism, which is equally false; for in many cases we may be obliged in Duty to separate: His Comparison of Cutting the Arm from the Body is like it self, Lame and Defective; for sometimes such a Scissure may be necessary to keep the Body from perishing: In short, if Separation be needless, it is sinful; if Uncharitable, it is Schismatical; if neither needless nor Uncharitable, it is a Duty; And let it be observed by the way, that in this Reply, the Gentleman acknowledges the Corinthians were guilty of Schism, though they did not Separate; when before he told us, he had proved that the Ratio formalis of Schism, consists in Separation, let him reconcile these things at his leisure.

He thinks if such Uncharitableness be Schism, it must follow, a minori ad majus, diversity of Communion is much more so; but the reasoning is not good, for Uncharitableness can in no case be lawful, but Separation may: He himself acknowledges, that if any of their terms of Communion be sinful, our Separation is justifiable; and yet even in this case, Uncharitableness would be a Sin.

If this Gentleman must needs let the World see his Talent in Conroversy, he should have taken up the true Question, as it was laid before him, What is that which the Scripture calls Schism? and should have proved in all those Instances, where mention is made of it, that there was not only Alienation of Affection, but diversity of Communion; and when he had done this, it had been time enough to have boasted, that he had answered Mr. H's Enquiry, till then his Labour is impertinent, and his Triumphs ridiculous.

But instead of observing this Proper and Necessary Method, which by all the Laws of Argument he was bound to, he ranges from the Point, and Chimes upon those decantate terms, Church, Unity, Communion, Obedience, Succession, &c. and is wonderfully pleased with the melodious Sound of words he does not understand; for though he should from these Topics, prove the Practice of Dissenters to be sinful, yet he cannot prove it to be that Sin which in Scripture is called Schism, unless he can discover in it, that Uncharitableness, and want of Christian Affection, which is the very thing called by that Name in sacred Writ.

This would be sufficient for the Defence of Mr. H's Enquiry, without ever entering upon the Lawfulness or Fault of Nonconformity; but since the

## The Preface.

the Valiant Man has challenged us into that Field of Argument, we have gone along with him into it, and endeavoured to justify our Practice not only from the Crime of Schism, but any other of which it has been accused, and how far we have succeeded in this Affair, is with all possible respect referred to the Censure of the Learned and Moderate of both Perswasions.

The grand Imperiencies exposed in the Gentleman's first Paper, he has endeavoured to defend in the latter; but through the Common Misfortune of a Man that meddles with what he does not understand, he is more bewildered and confounded than before; and indeed of all things that ever set up for a Defence of so Learned a Party as the Episcopal, I never saw any thing comparable to this, for Style and Argument, unless it were the famous Works of Mrs. Eleanor James, to which this Gentleman's Reply bears such a marvellous resemblance, that a man would almost conclude it to be the issue of some Friendly Conference betwixt our Citizen, and that renowned Heroine.

I wonder why he should be so much disturbed, that the Vindicator has concealed his Name, especially when he did not think fit to discover his own; for T. W. Citizen of Chester, is a Cypher so general, as remits us to conjecture, and common fame, and leaves him room to escape, if any such danger should happen, as he portends concerning his adversary; but what great matter is it, who is meant by T. W. or what that mans name is, that has adventured to encounter him; it is not names, but things, that we have to examine; and yet by his little contemptible menaces, it is very apparent, that he would gladly beake himself to their former way of Confuting Dissenters, as that which was always found to be the most easie and effectual.

He Triumphs in the Effects of his former Paper, one of which was, few believed but that it was done by some Clergy-man, who had prevailed with him to Print it in his Name; That is to say, they thought it beyond the length of T. W. to write such a Book; a shrewd sign, that his Neighbours have no great Opinion of his Abilities, if they thought such stuff was above him; but as his Name is capable of giving little Reputation to another mans work, so I dare say no Clergy-man in Chester will grudge him the Honour of his own.

He would not be thought, to have acted beneath himself in his Reply, and therefore he magnifies the Stature of his Adversary, and transforms the Vindicator into a Ship, and by all means, it must be one of the first Rate, that was chosen to Attack and Fire all its Guns, at his mighty Self, so happy a thing it is to have Gazetts and News Letters always at hand, where a man can never fail of being furnished, with Admirable Metaphors, but (if we must needs speak in such Bombardick Language) though the Vindicator was sixe enough, for the



## The Preface.

the Service assigned him, yet there was no need of choosing a Man of War of the first Rate, to engage a disabled Frigate, whose Mast and Yards and Tackling, had suffered miserably in some hot Sea-fights heretofore. Maj.

But 'tis no part of my design, to vie with him in his Bantering Dialect, I shall therefore apply my self in good earnest, to the matter in Hand, and in the Remainder of this Preface, defend some lesser Passages in the Vindicator, which this Gentleman either does not understand, or will not seem to do so, and afterwards proceed to the more material parts of the Controversie.

In his first Paper he pretends to tell us, of the Origination and first Existence of the Church, which he dates only from the time of Pentecost, mentioned Acts 2. The Vindicator thought there was Reason to find fault with that Account of the Matter, not only because it excludes the Angels, which but a few Lines before, this Gentleman had told us, were members of the Church, but especially, because it shuts out the Jewish Church, as it stood in Old Testament Times; but he has a Salvo ready such as it is, and he that can content himself with such a one will never be at want, for thus it goes, "The Church was never called Catholick before that Pentecost, the Wall of Partition nor being broken down; But if I mistake not, he promised to shew us, when the Church had its first Existence, not when it acquired a new Title; it's an odd way of arguing, The Church was first called Catholick at Pentecost, therefore it had its first Existence it — miserable Consequence, and yet as good as the Antecedent, for 'tis true that the Church was called Catholick at that time, nor do we find it once so called in all the Scripture that I know of (and the Wall of Partition was broken down at Christ's Death, when the Vail of the Temple was rent in sunder) and if in spite of all Reason the Existence of a Church must needs commence with its acquist of a new Title, he must still fix his Epochs much lower; and yet I know not, why the Name Catholick, may not (if men please) be attributed to the Jewish Church, which was before its Apostacy the whole, and the true Visible Church of God upon Earth.

The Vindicator told him, nothing could be proved from the bare Name of Bishops in Scripture-times, to favour our English Prelacy, till the Power of those Bishops, the Extent of their Dioceses, the Quality of their Under-Officers, the Modes of their Worship, and Terms of Communion, be proved to be the same with ours, or liable to the same Exceptions; To this the Gentleman replies, "I cannot understand this last Sentence (or liable to the same Exceptions,) unless he would make "the Primitive Church liable to the same Exceptions; But I hope we are not to be blamed, for the dullness of his understanding; The Expression is Plain and Pertinent, He knows very well what Exceptions we

## The Preface.

make, against the Power of our English Prelates, &c. Now if he can prove that the same Objections he against the Primitive Episcopacy, he shows thereby that they are frivolous and unjust, and throws them out of doors, as militating against Scripture Bishops as well as ours; one would have thought the meanest Citizen in Chester, might have understood this, but it will never be better, when men take upon them to be Authors, in spite of Nature and Education.

He condemns the Vindicator, as having no regard to Ecclesiastical Antiquity, for speaking of Scripture Rules, before they were written, this lets us see, What Mercy we may expect from him, when we stand in need of it: We will endeavour therefore to be as little beholden to him as we can; and as to this matter, a few Words will evince, that his Reflection is very unjust.

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 2.

In his former Paper, speaking of the Progress of the Gospel, and planting the seven Asian Churches, in St. Johns time, he adds, Though there was a Multiplication of Churches, yet no Variation; here the Vindicator enquired; What does he mean in saying there was no Variation? Was there no variety at all in any Circumstance of Worship that's *gratis dictum*? if he means there was no Variation from Scripture Rules, (though we are afraid that will scarce hold yet) we wish it had been so still. Now it seems the Vindicators Error was, he spoke of Scripture Rules in the Apostolical Age, and they were not then written: No? That's something strange, were not the Gospels and Epistles writ by Evangelists and Apostles, during the time of their Lives? No Legend that ever I heard of, tells us of their rising from the dead, and writing to the Churches; And if they writ their Epistles, containing Rules for Divine Worship, why may not those be called Scripture Rules: What if they were not collected as soon as they were writ, were they not therefore both Scripture, and Authoritative? And yet every Learned Man think the Canon of Scripture was collected in St. Johns time, and that this awful Sanction, If any shall add to these things, God will add unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book, &c. Refers not only to the Apocalypse, but to the whole Canon, and stands like the Cherub with a flaming Sword to Guard the Tree of Life, and if this Gentleman be for Scripture Rules, that were not written in the Time of the Apostles, I despair of ever coming to an agreement with him.

And it is certain, there is a very material difference between us, about the Rule and Standard of Controversie, which must be first adjusted, before we can well proceed any further, for if we take different Measures, we shall certainly give a very different account.

Mr. H. desirous to find out the true Notion of Schism, takes for his Rule, all those places in the New Testament, where that Word is found;

This

## The Preface.

*This the Gentleman is offended at, and tells him, "If he had required " into the ninth Article of the Apostles Creed, then he had found out " the true Standard of this Controversy; And the Vindicator thinks, there was more Reason to be offended with him, for declining the sufficiency of the Scripture, as the standard of Faith and Practice, than he censured as an affront to Scripture, and common Sense too, for when the Authority of that Creed depends solely upon its agreement with Scripture, how senseless a thing is it, to make that a truer Standard than Scripture, whose Truth and meaning is to be derived purely from it? What defence now will the Citizen make? As good as he can afford no doubt; He charges the Vindicator with saying, that an Article of Faith, is an affront to Scripture and Common Sense, which is as false as any thing in the World, we appeal to the Readers Eyes, and desire no other favour, but that he Read true.*

*To bring himself off, he acknowledges, " That the Scripture indeed is " the true touch-stone of Sin and Duty, but he adds, whoever he be that " expounds the Holy Scripture, in Contradiction to an Article of the Creed, " must needs err; and we are assured of the Error, by that Article is " contradictory.*

*Should we grant this to be good Sense and Decency, yet it will not serve his turn; for then he should not have accused Mr. H. of taking a wrong Standard, but have proved, that he made an Erroneous Application of the true One to his Case, which are two different things; a man may take a true measure, and yet mistake in measuring a thing by it, but to tell him in the former Paper, of not finding out the true standard, and to think to come off in this, by blaming his Exposition of it, is a very sorry shift, which his Ignorance, or Inadvertency has forced him upon.*

*And yet we must not let him go, without further Examination about this matter, for it is certain he is fallen into a most dangerous Error, making the Compilers of the Apostolical and Nicene Creeds, the Infallible Interpreters of Scripture; for so he tells us. We come to be infallibly assured, that the Socinian Interpretation of Scripture against the Divinity of Christ is False, because it contradicts that Article, I believe in Jesus the only begotten Son of God, and that is the Nicene Creed, God of God, very God of very God, being of one Substance with the Father.*

*This is an Opinion, which his own Spiritual Guides, are obliged to rebuke him for, being so contrary to the avowed Principles of all Protestant Churches, and to what our Learned Doctors have worthily asserted in their late Writings against the Papists, to which I refer him for his better Information, amongst others, let him consult the Ingenious Dr. Sherlock, in his Preservative against Popery, where having declared that*

## The Preface.

Part 1st.  
P. 49.

the Protestants abide by that, which they see plainly proved out of Scripture, bids us put this Question, "How shall we know what is the true sense of Scriptures, and proposes three ways, either by an Infallible Interpreter, or the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, or by such humane means as are used, to find out the sense of other Books; He rejects the Pretensions of an Infallible Interpreter, and disapproves of the Rule of Expounding Scripture by the Consent of the Fathers, and concludes there is no way left, but to expound it as we do other Writings, by considering the Signification, and Propriety of Words, and Phrases, the Scope and Context of the Place, the Reason of things, the Analogy between the Old and New Testament, and the like.

Our Citizen has found out that Infallible Interpreter, which the Learned Doctor was ignorant of; He is infallibly assured of the Divinity of Christ, because the Compilers of the Apostolical and Nicene Creeds, have so Interpreted Scripture; but what if one should ask him, How he is sure the Doctrines of the Creed are true Expositions of Scripture? Either he must fall into the Circle, or resolve his Faith into the Infallibility of the Church, and Compilers of these Creeds; and therein he turns his back upon the Church of England, and all the Reformed, in one of the Principal and most Important Points of Controversie, the Rejection of Faith.

I will not suppose him so ignorant, as to think that the Apostles were the Authors of that Creed, that goes under their Name; Bishop Pearson, and Dr. Towerfon, will tell him the contrary, and by the Confession of all Protestants, These Creeds are but summary Collections of the most principal Doctrines of Faith, put into that form by Fallible Men, and are to be received no further, and on no other account, than as they are Consonant to the Word of God, and therefore were never intended, as a Standard or Rule of Faith, or as an infallible Interpreter of that which is so; I wonder how this Gentleman would have been infallibly assured of the Divinity of Christ, if he had lived before these Symbols were extant, I wonder, how he is infallibly assured of the true sense of these Creeds? I doubt, he wants one Creed to give an Infallible Interpretation of another, and so ad Infinitum; but if he say, the sense of these Creeds is very plain and obvious to any ordinary Capacity, so is the Scripture too in all Fundamental Points, and is sufficient Assurance of the Truth of them, without the joint Security of Ancient Creeds and Churches.

Whether these odd Opinions, are to be imputed to his inconsiderateness, of which every Page affords us instances enough, or rather to the Happy  
Ilu-

## The Preface.

Illuminations, of his great Rabbi, Mr. Dodwell, I will not determine; but the latter is not improbable, if we compare it, with what that Ambigious Gentleman writes, "That the Power actually received by Ordained Ministers must not be measured by the true Sense of Scriptures, but by that wherein the Ordainers understood them, &c. Many other Facts of the like Nature, have proceeded from that great Oracle, which would scarcely have been encouraged or so much as suffered in any Reformed Church besides our own, but it was sufficient to make these things passable, that they were levelled at the Dissenters, and sent them all headlong into the Pit." Separation of Churches, p. 542.

I think it may not be amiss to defend the Vindicator from the Imputation of Malice, against the late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, which this Gentleman very unfairly suggests; the Passage aimed at, is this, "To say, that Bishops, which are stated Pastors in an Organical Church, are the Apostles Successors, in their Apostolical Power, is destructive to their own Notion of Church Government, and would give the Bishop of Rome as great Power in England, as the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury (when there is any.) All the Malice lies in this little Parenthesis, when there is any, and here the Citizen clamours upon him, for reviling Gods High Priest, and speaking evil of the Ruler of his People; What Apology will the Vindicator now make? Truly, if it was my own Case, I would desire no better, than that of St. Paul under the same Accusation, I wist not Brethren, that he was the High Priest. The late Arch Bishop, had been deprived by Law, above half a Year before that Vindication was writ, and the Metropolitane See was vacant, a considerable time after this was Printed, and yet it was a malicious Reviling of the Ruler of Gods People, to say there was none, I will not drive this too far, I hope he can give a better Reason for calling the Deprived Prelate the Ruler of Gods People than I can for him; If he was the Ruler still, What becomes of the Authority of those that deprived him? It had been more becoming this Gentleman, to have answered that Argument, wherein this Parenthesis had its Place, than by falling foul upon so Innocent an Expression, to expose those thoughts, which Prudence would have concealed." Vindic. p. 28. Reply, p. 18.

I know not of any thing else in his Reply that needs to be taken notice of, but what will fall under the General Heads of this following Treatise; wherein I have attempted (at least) to prove, that our Congregations, are not Schismatical, or Unlawful, though many of our Ministers, were not Ordained by Diocesan Bishops, though the Places we meet in be distinct from the Parish Churches, and the Mode of our Worship in some things different from theirs.

And



## The Preface.

*And because I find the most Learned of our Adversaries condemn our  
Present Practice,*

- 1. As Inconsistent with Catholick Unity and Communion.*
- 2. As Guilty of Disobedience to Superiours, Civil and Spiritual.*
- 3. And of Scandalous Indecencies, and a Breach of good Rules and Order, I shall examine the matter as carefully as I can under all these Particulars, heartily Praying that whatever Censures, I bring upon myself, the Interests of Truth and Peace may be promoted.*

---

## ERRATA.

**P**Age, 6. l. 38. r. retain'd. p. 16. l. 13. r. consciouf-  
ness. p. 20. margin, r. August. p. 33. l. 38.  
r. Diaboli instinctu. p. 37. l. 15. & p. 38. l. 12.  
for rite, r. right. p. 117. l. 17. for Ananias r. A-  
nianus. Several lesser faults will occur, which are  
referr'd to the Reader's Candor and Emendation.

# A Defence of the Vindication, &c.

## CHAP. I.

*The true Notion of Catholick Unity; distinguished into Political and Moral. A Regular Ministry not Essential to this Unity. The Judgment of the Fathers and others.*

**I**T is the observation of an Ingenious Gentleman, that the World has never been without some extraordinary word, to fill mens mouths, and furnish out Pamphlets, and by which the Sentiments of men, have been for the most part more absolutely governed, than by the true reason of things; for Reason concludes nothing, without disquisition; but the other, like a kind of spell, captivates and determines mens thoughts, many times beyond the Relief, of the most rational and convincing Arguments.

Amongst all the Charms of this nature, which take place as the Interests and Designs of Parties, or posture of Publick Affairs, vary and direct. I know of none, that has been more unmercifully tortured, and forced to speak things never intended by it, than this of *Unity*. It has been the Motto, and Device, of every Ascendant Party, in the Militant Church, to frighten the weak and timorous, and chastise the more resolute opposers of Spiritual Usurpation and Tyranny.

The Papists, for the good Service it has done them, have pretend'd it to be the Seventh Note of their Church, according to the Order in which their great Cardinal has marshall'd them; and under the Umbirage thereof, have raised the greatest Feuds and Divisions, that ever infested the Christian World. In their most bloody Persecutions, barbarous and fustest Tragedies, they have still pretended to act by the Commission of Catholick Unity, to advance her Interests, and to make her glorious in the World; when in the mean time, Christianity it self has been rendered odious and contemptible, Turks, Jews, and Pagans, have beheld her flames with pleasure, and warmed themselves, and said, *Aha, thus we would have it.*

It must not be denied, but that Catholick Unity, where it is to happy as to be understood, acquaints us with something very sacred and venerable, of which we cannot be too fond or tender, it bears the Image of Divinity; and if it were not in it self a most excellent thing, the name of it, could never be made so specious a pretence.

Arch-Rebel,  
p. 28.  
Reply, p. 1.

It has been often, and confidently asserted, that all the Dissenters in *England*, have departed from the Unity and Communion of the Catholic Church: This lies as a mighty prejudice in the minds of many, both against our way, and persons too; and their common Inference from hence is, That we are out of a State of Salvation, have no right to any of the Promises of the Gospel, that all our Hopes are unwarrantable and groundless Fancies; that we are contemners of the Peace and Unity which Christ has bequeathed to his Church; and if they will demonstrate, that our case is indeed such as they describe it, we will not persist in it a day longer, for we cannot be so fond of the Inconveniencies of Non-Conformity here, as merely for the sake thereof to purchase to our selves, greater Miseries hereafter.

But that we may evince, how void of Reason and Humanity, the Sentence which they have past upon us is, let us enquire, wherein the Catholic Unity and Communion of the Church consists, and then try, whether none of our Dissenting Congregations be within the Verge of it.

By this Catholic Unity, our Adversaries understand, not that which is accidental, may be present or absent without the destruction of the Subject, which some Churches may have, and other True Churches may be without, for then it would not serve their purpose, which is to conclude all that want this Unity, to be in a State of Damnation; and indeed it is the truest acceptation of the word, to make it signify Essential Universal Unity, (Uniformity in accidentals belonging more properly to the common place of order) in this sense, therefore we shall speak of it, that we may come up as close to their thoughts as we can.

Nothing then belongs to the Catholic Unity of the Church, but what belongs to the being of the Church; that which makes it a Church makes it one; *Ess & Unum* being convertible; and nothing can dissolve its Unity which does not destroy its Essence; and certainly the being, and the state of the Church must not be confounded: Many things are required to the due and orderly state and form, in which the Church ought to be, and appear in the World, and which may contribute to her stability, beauty and enlargement, which suppose her Essence, but do not constitute it.

This Essential Catholic Unity whereof we speak, may be distinguished into Political and Moral.

Political, whereby all the True Members of the Church are united unto Christ the Head, and that is by true Faith: And

Moral, by which they are United one to another, and that is by Christian Love, which in some degree always follows the former; those that have a mind to it, may quarrel with the terms of this distinction; but if I may but express my meaning by them, I shall not be at all concerned about it.

1. *The Political Unity*, is that which does primarily, necessarily, and immediately constitute, that Sacred Society, the Church of God, which was therefore by the Primitive Christians, as well as our first Reformers, frequently known by this short definition, *Causa fidelium*, the Congregation of the

the Faithful ; sometimes, the Body of Christ, the Temple of God, and such *Disse. Instit.*  
 like : So *Lactantius, Ecclesia est verum Templum Dei quod non in parietibus* *L. 4. c. 13.*  
*est, sed in corde, & fide hominum, qui credunt in eum, & vocantur fideles;*  
 The Church is the True Temple of God, which does not consist in the bare  
 Walls, but in the Hearts, and Faith of Men that believe on him, and are  
 called Faithful ; and before him *Ignatius*, in the same sense calls it,  
*Εκκλησία των Αγίων, συναγωγή δ' ας, συναγωγή Αγίων*, The Holy Congregation, the  
 Assembly of the Saints. To the same purpose speak all those Fathers who  
 affirm, that the Church was built upon the Faith of *Peter*, not upon his  
 Person or Authority, a great Cloud whereof, the Illustrious *Chamier*, has  
 collected to our hand, proving thereby, that our Union with the Church, is  
 founded in our believing on Christ, the True Foundation, and Chief Corner  
 Stone, nothing therefore can dissolve this Union, but what is inconsistent with  
 True Faith in Christ.

*Ep. ad Trall.*  
*vid. Epist. Pe-*  
*l. Epist. L3.*  
*Ep. 247.*

*De Occumen.*  
*Post. L. 11. c. 4.*

And this agrees fully, with the tenour of Holy Scripture, which every  
 where lays the Salvation of Men upon their believing, *1 Pet. 2. 6. Behold I Ephes. 3. 17.*  
*lay in Zion a Chief Corner Stone, elect, precious, and he that believeth on him* *4. 13.*  
*shall not be confounded.* By this Faith Men are United to Christ, and there-  
 fore cannot be divided from his Body which is the Church. *St. Paul* calls  
 the Church of God, the House or Family of God, and how a Man comes  
 to be a Member of that Noble Family, we are told, *Ep. 2. 18.* by the Spirit  
 (i. e. working of Faith) we have access unto the Father, and are no more  
 Strangers and Foreigners, but Fellow-Citizens of the Saints, and of the Houf-  
 hold of God ; and therefore this Household of God is elsewhere called the  
 Household of Faith. In short, nothing is more evident than that the Apostles  
 received Men and Women into the Visible Church by Baptism, upon the  
 Profession of their Faith in Christ, and thereby invested them in all the Sacred  
 Privileges of the New Covenant, which belong only to the Church of  
 God.

*Gal. 6. 10.*

This Excellent Grace of Faith, from whence our Union with Christ, and  
 his Body the Church doth flow, is a very comprehensive thing, it includes  
 our solemn and hearty Choice of the Eternal God, as our chiefest Happiness,  
 and hereby all the True Members of the Church, are United in the Love and  
 Service of One God, and so distinguished from the Pagan World ; and in an  
 humble assistance in One Mediator, in whose hand alone, they are brought  
 back unto God, and hereby are distinguished from Mahometans, and those  
 that call themselves Deists, they are also United in the gracious Influences of  
 One blessed Spirit ; and hereby are distinguished from all impenitent sensual  
 persons, who have grieved and quenched that Spirit : And they are hereby  
 United in One Rule of Faith, Worship, and Obedience ; not that they all  
 understand this Rule alike, or are fully conformed unto it ; but in this they  
 agree, that they all take it for their Rule, and endeavour an Universal Com-  
 pliance with it, and are distinguished hereby from all that reject this Law,  
 and set up any other in opposition to it : This Faith likewise Unites them

in One Baptism, not that they all agree in the External Washing, and Modes of Administration, but in that which the Apostle *Peter* makes to be the Substance of it, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of  
 1 Pet. 2. 21. a good Conscience towards God, when a Mans Conscience returns a consenting Answer to the Gospel Proposals, and by a solemn Self-dedication becomes Sacred to God, he has then the Substance of that Ordinance.

This is the True Catholick Unity, described in the 4th of *Ephes.* 3, 6.  
*There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as you are called in one Hope of your Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and the Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*

2. *The Moral Unity*, by which the Members are knit one to another, is that of Love: This is the Unity of the Spirit, which is to be held in the bond of Peace, and will always flow from the other, by a kind of Spiritual Sympathy and Sensation; but it must be acknowledged, this admits of various degrees, and is subject to sinful Declensions; Emulation, Passion, Interest, Misunderstanding of Persons and Things, may very much weaken the Bond of Amity, but it must be habitually in every True Christian; and he that has no brotherly kindness, for those that appear to him True Believers can never know that he has passed from Death to Life.

Mistakes and Weakness, may create Jealousie, and too great Distances even amongst great and good Men. *Paul* and *Barnabas* from different apprehensions about the management of their Work, proceed to a parting one from another: And too many Brethren, that have all the same Father, and are all bound for the same home, cannot forbear falling out by the way: The Corruption of Nature both sullies mens Graces, that they do not shine forth so clearly as otherwise they would, and also darkens their sight, that they cannot so well discern the Virtues of each other, and where the Eye is dim, and the Object clouded too, no wonder if misapprehensions and uncharitable surmises arise, and men mistake one another for Enemies, and fall a quarrelling, when perhaps a true Light would let them see they are all Friends.

But certainly, as far as Believers understand one another, they have Christian Affection one for another; and if they knew more of the Truth of each others Christianity, their Mutual Love would be greatly increased. And a shyness in some tempers, and unwillingness to converse more freely, and often together, keep up mens prejudices, and hinder their desired Union; and yet they have still a fervent Love for the Church in general, though their Affections be misplaced as to particular persons.

This Brotherly-kindness, where it is prevalent, will oblige the Members to have the same care one for another, not envying, but rejoicing at each others Health, Beauty, and Improvement, it would make them sensible of each others usefulness and service, they would not think any part superfluous, or tie it up from performing its duty towards the good of the whole; the Eye would not say to the Hand, I have no need of thee: This would not permit



not them to reproach and despise each other, for their blemishes and deformities; but oblige them to cover the same with the greatest candour and civility, and to bestow more abundant honour upon those parts that may be thought less honourable.

This is that great Law of Love which the King of the Church has given to all his Disciples, as the Bond of Peace amongst themselves, and the great Characteristick by which they shall be distinguished from others: By this shall all men know that they are Christ's Disciples, if they love one another. John 13.34.  
Where the Soul is wholly destitute of this, all pretences of Love to God, or Faith in Christ, are false and vain; *For he that loves not his Brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen?* 1 John 4.20. And true Faith will work by Love.

I know this Account of Catholick Unity, as consisting in Faith and Love, will not meet with general approbation: Many will reject it as to spiritual, who have placed their hopes of Salvation in being of such a Party, and in a Zealous Observation of the Rites and Ceremonies of that Communion in which they are, these are too senseless to be argued with, That can suppose the Son of God would be incarnate, and crucified, only to teach men a particular kind of dress, and fashionable gestures, and a form of words, &c. whilst their Souls are under the dominion of sin; and they have not learned to live soberly, righteously, and godly in an Evil World.

Many will censure it as too narrow, excluding from the Church, all formal and insincere pretenders to Christianity; but I suppose when we understand one another, we shall not much differ about this; it is certain in *Foro Dei*, none but true Disciples are true Church-Members; but in *Foro Ecclesiæ*, all that seem to be so, must be so accounted. When we say, such a one is a Member of the Visible Church, we mean, he is visibly a Member of the Church, that is, he appears so to us; and we are obliged to think so of him, till he discovers the contrary; but whether he be really so or no, God only knows.

And most will condemn this Notion, as too large and general, including even those that have not a Regular Ministry amongst them, nor are joyned to any particular Congregation, duly organized: And here indeed the main difficulty we have to encounter is about the Unity of the Ministry, and how far that is essential to the Unity of the Catholick Church.

And I freely grant, every True Member of the Church of Christ, will give great deference to the Ministerial Office; and whoever they be, that will presume to ridicule the Function, and despise its just Powers, cannot in reason be thought to have the Faith and Charity of the Gospel. But there must be a great difference made, betwixt condemning the Ministry, and questioning the Rights of this or that particular person to the Office, or scrupling the Terms or Mode of his Administrations, or preferring another before him, whose Qualifications and Conduct are more answerable to the great Ends of that Office.

But

But though I do verily believe, it is essential to Catholick Church Ministry, that every Member love and honour the Ministerial Function; yet, I dare by no means affirm it to be equally necessary, that every Person be under the Conduct of a Regular and duly called Ministry; this indeed, is requisite to the flourishing State of the Church, and all are obliged to pray for it, and endeavour it in their several Spheres of Activity; but it is not absolutely Necessary to the Being of the Church, or the Salvation of her Members. My Reasons are these:

1st. This would be to confound the Unity of the Church, with its Order, which must be distinguished here, where we speak of Essential Unity; that which belongs to the Order of the Church always supposes its Essence; a thing must first be, before it be capable of Order: Thus the Excellent *Histor. Des. of* Monsieur *Claude* argues, "To admit that to be a true Church where the *the Reform.* Ministry is, and deny that to be a true Church, where the Ministry is not, is a vain, deceitful and illusory way of reasoning; For the true Church naturally goes before the Ministry, and does not depend upon the Ministry, but the Ministry on the contrary depends upon it; as in the Civil Society, the Magistracy depends upon the Society, and not the Society on the Magistracy. In the Civil Society, the first thing that must be thought on, is, That Nature made Men; afterwards we conceive that she Asssembled and United them together. And lastly, from that Union which could not subsist without Order, Magistracy proceeded. It is the same thing in a Religious Society: The first thing that Grace did, was to produce Faith in the hearts of Men, after having made them believe she united them, and formed a mutual Communion between them; and, because their Communion ought not to be without Order, and good Government; from thence the Ministry arose. So that a Lawful Ministry is after the true Church, and depending upon it. And a great deal more to the same purpose.

2dly, This would make it utterly unlawful for the Laity to Reform the Church from Idolatry, or other Abuses, unless the Clergy would joyn with them in it; and so would condemn those Princes and Churches in *Germany*, and elsewhere, that Reformed without their Bishops; yea, against their Wills, and repeated clamorous Prohibitions. Either the Popish Bishops and Clergy, were the regular Ministry of those Churches, before the Reformation, or no; if they were not, then there was no Regular Ministry amongst them, and the Line of Succession failed; and either they had no Churches, or else their Churches remain'd their Beings without the Ministry: But if the Popish Clergy were the Regular Ministry, Then either those that Reformed without them, were cut off from the Unity of the Catholick Church, and Reformed themselves into Hell, as the Papists speak, or else they were still in the Unity of the Church, though at present without a Regular Ministry.

Those that will needs thrust the Unity of the Episcopacy into the Definition of the Catholick Church, would do well to consider, Every Nation was

not so happy as *England*, in having Bishops so willing to comply with their Rulers, in a Secession from *Rome*; or in having Rulers so Potent and resolved as ours were: And yet God forbid any Protestant should say, they ought to have delayed their Reformation, till they had disgusted Princes, and complying Bishops to lead them on. Surely, the lawfulness of our Departure from *Rome*, does not depend upon such contingencies. How few Bishops there were that gave the least countenance to *Luther's* Proceedings, none can be ignorant, that has read any thing of the History of that Reformation; the Ministry they had was generally chosen by themselves, out of the most learned of the Laicks, some few of the Priests and Monks falling in; the Nobles themselves sometimes devoted their Gifts to the Service of the Church, as the Prince of *Anbals*, *Du Plessis*, *Sadolet*, and others; they never insisted upon an uninterrupted Line, but maintained, "That where the true Faith and Doctrine were, there was the true Church: and that it is the Call of *Claudes Hist.* the Church, and the Approbation of the most competent Judges therein, *Def. Part 4.* that makes a Lawful Call of Persons to that Office, and that the Church *p. 58.* has a full and entire Right to set up Ministers for its Government, supposing it have the true Faith.

3dly, If there can be no true Church without a Regular Ministry, what becomes of the Being of a Church, when its Ministers are dead and banished, and no other yet chosen? By this Notion the Church must be dissolved and die with them, and the Death of the Shepherd must be the Damnation of the Flock; for if the Regular Ministry of each particular Church be the great Ligament, by which that part is fastned to the whole, it must needs follow, that upon the Failure of the Ministry, it falls off from the Body, and consequently from Christ the Head. If it be replied, that such Societies remain in the Unity of the Church, whilst they desire a true Ministry, and endeavour to get one, though at present they are without it, That's as much as we demand; for then it is not essential to Catholick Unity, that there be a Regular Ministry, but that there be a desire of it; and no doubt all true Christians have such desires, and the great difference amongst them is, which Ministry is most Regular; and it is their apprehension of the greater Regularity of theirs than of others, that makes each side of them prefer their own before others.

In short, if we admit the absolute Necessity, of such a Ministry, under whose Conduct every Church must be; what shall we say of those Scandalous Tumults and Contentions that have happened about the Election of Bishops? one Party choosing this, another that; sometimes falling to downright blows, and the stronger Side winning the day, such things often happened in the earlier Ages of the Church, and sometimes the Controversie was a long time undecided, and yet far be it from us to think the Essence of those Churches was lost, during those Contentions; it is true, some have invented a Metropolitan or Patriarch, to whom those Churches remained United, in the vacancy of the Episcopal Sees, to save the Body from perishing, and over these

*Voss. de Disp.*  
*Cas. Pap. l. 2.*  
*52. Ch. 3.*  
*p. 243.*

the Pope as the principal visible Head of Unity; but I hope I need not prove that there may be Catholick Unity without these.

I expect to be assaulted with that Text, *Rom. 10. 14. & 15. How shall they believe in him; of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a Preacher, and how shall they Preach unless they be sent* by this sending, I know many understand Regular Ordination to the Work of the Ministry; and they would infer from hence, that none can believe, but by the Preaching, of a rightly Ordained Ministry; which must therefore be necessary to the very being of the Church.

Rassius, l. 1.  
c. 10.

But it is certain, the Word and Works of God never contradict one another, and therefore this cannot be the sense of the place; for we read of great Conversions made, by the Preaching of those, that were never so Ordained; as those of the *Abyssines* by *Ermentius* and *Edeus*, and the *Roman Merchants*, and the *Iberians* by a Captive Maid; as for this Text, it plainly speaks of that Extraordinary Mission of the Apostles to the Gentile World; by them, as Men infallibly inspired for that End, were the great Doctrines of the Gospel delivered, and the perpetual Rule of Faith laid down, this they must by no means have presumed to do, had they not been sent of God; and yet without such a Gospel the World had never believed on Christ, and this Apostolical Doctrine is still the great Instrument, by which God converts Souls sometimes by reading of, it themselves, sometimes by hearing it from others, whether duly ordained, or no, sometimes by bringing it to their Remembrance when they are neither reading nor hearing it; though the usual way is by the Preaching of a faithful Ordained Ministry; but to say, that it is never done by other means, cannot be proved by Scripture, and is evidently contradicted by Experience.

Hist. Def.  
Part 4. p. 54.

I cannot but have a great value for the Judgment, of *Monsieur Claude* in this particular, and shall therefore transcribe his words, in that learned Treatise before mentioned, viz. "It is the Church that produces the Ordinary Ministry, and not the Ordinary Ministry that produces the Church; The Church was the fruit of the Extraordinary Ministry of the Apostles and Evangelists; That Ministry of theirs, produc'd it at first, and not only produc'd it, but it has always made use of that means, or that source for its Subsistence; and we may truly say, That it yet produceth it, and that it will produce it unto the End of the World: For it is the Faith that makes, and always will make the Church, and it is the Ministry of the Apostles that makes and always will make the Faith: It is their Voice that calls Christians together at this day; it is their word that assembles them, and their teaching that unites them. It is certain that the Ministry of the Apostles was singular; that is to say, only tyed to their Persons, without Succession, without Communication or Propagation; but it ought not to be thought that it was also transitory, as that of other Men, for it is perpetual in the Church; Death has not shut their Mouths as it has others, they speak, they instruct, they incessantly spread abroad Faith and Holiness."

" self among the Souls of Christians, and there is not another Fountain from  
 " whence those Virtues can descend but from them. If any demand of us,  
 " what is the perpetual Voice that we ascribe unto them? We answer, That  
 " it is the Doctrine of the New Testament, where they have set down all the  
 " Efficacy of their Ministry, and the whole virtue of that Word, which gave  
 " a Being to the Church; there is their true Chair and Apostolick See; there  
 " is the Center of Christian Unity; there it is that they incessantly call Men,  
 " and joyn them into a Society—— But as to the ordinary Ministry, we  
 " cannot say the same thing of them, it is not their Voice as distinct from  
 " that of the Apostles, that begets the Faith, that assembles Christians into a  
 " Society, or that produces the Church; They are no more but meer Dispen-  
 " sers of the words of the Apostles, or external Instruments, to make us the  
 " better understand their Voice, to speak properly, it is not the Voice of  
 " the ordinary Pastors, that produces Faith, where it was not before, it is the  
 " word of the Apostles themselves; They are no more but those External  
 " Guides, that God has established in the Church to lead Men to the Scrip-  
 " ture, and even such Guides as cannot hinder us from going thither of our  
 " selves, if we will;—— Therefore there is a great difference betwixt  
 " these two sorts of Ministers, the one preceded the Church, the other follows  
 " it; the one has an independent and sovereign Authority, with Infallibility  
 " on its side; the other is exposed to Vices, Disorders, Errors and humane  
 " Weaknesses, inferior to, and depending on the Church.

And indeed to affirm that no Man can be truly converted but by a Regu-  
 lar Ministry, would involve the Minds of Men in endless Perplexities: A  
 Man must know all those things that belong to the due mission of the Prea-  
 cher, and must be assured that all those met in the person, by whose Mini-  
 stry he was helped to believe, before he can know that he has true Faith;  
 this would keep persons in a dark and uncomfortable state all their days,  
 especially if a Line of uninterrupted Succession be necessary to a true Mission;  
 for then a Man must be able to prove, that the Bishop that ordained his  
 Converter, was ordained by another Bishop, and that by another, and so  
 up to the Apostles; which, because no man in the World can be morally  
 assured of, it is impossible for any Man to know that he has true Faith. This  
 is an insuperable difficulty on the one hand.

And on the other, those Persons that know they have true Faith by the  
 powerful effects of it upon their Hearts and Lives, must conclude from hence  
 that their Preachers were duly ordained and called, otherwise they could  
 not have been instrumental in their Conversion; and yet this would not be  
 true; for doubtless there are many honest Souls that fear God, and work  
 Righteousness amongst those Sects, that have no Regular Ministry amongst  
 them: So that this Assertion would rob many Souls of the comfort of a  
 true Faith, because of the uncertainty of their Ministers Mission; and it would  
 confirm others in an irregular and unauthorized Ministry, because of the cer-  
 tainty of their Faith.



I hope by this time I may venture to conclude, That the essential Unity of the Church, consists in Gospel-Faith and Love, hereby Men are made Saints, and united to Christ, and Members of the Catholick Church. Did I think the *Chfster* Gentleman would not yet take it, I would be so civil to him, as to add some more Testimonies.

That of *Clement Alexandrinus* is apposite enough, *The ancient Catholick Church is but one only Church, and assemblies in the Unity of one only Faith, by the Will of one only God, and Ministration of one only Lord, all those who were before Predestinated to be just, having known them before the Foundation of the World.* So likewise *Origen*, *The Church is the Society of the Saints*; and elsewhere, *The Church which God builds consists in those who are upright, and full of those Thoughts, Words and Actions which lead to Blessedness.* *St. Ambrose* tells us, *The Assembly of the Righteous is God's Tabernacle*, and that the *Saints are the Members of Jesus Christ.* *Tertullian* says, *Where there are Three, there is a Church, though they be Laicks, for every one lives by his own Faith.*

*St. Jerome* speaks to the same purpose, saying, *The Church which is the Assembly of all Saints, is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, because she has in Jesus Christ an Eternal firmness*; (and elsewhere) *The Church is the Assembly of all the Saints.* And again, *The City of the Lord is the Church of the Saints, the Congregation of the Just.* *St. Austin* speaking of the visible or mixt Church, distinguishes it into two Nations, *Jerusalem and Babylon*; the *Faithful*, and the *Wicked*: the latter may be in the Visible Church, but are not really of the Church; and says, *The Rights of the Church belong only to the Faithful.*

Amongst the Divines of the Reformed Churches, the Incomparable *Jarvis* speaks as fully to the purpose as we can desire; He describes the Unity of the Church, by the Unity of the Spirit, the Unity of Doctrine, and the Unity of the Sacraments; and exposes the Bishop of *Meaux*, for making the Unity of the Ministry, necessary to Salvation; saying, "They must have lost their Senses that suffer themselves to be deluded with such Imaginations, as if the Medicine must be given by such a hand, or else it would not heal, but poison them; and adds, *Ab my Brethren, open your Eyes upon this Folly, and be ashamed thereof, be sure, every hand that gives you the true Doctrine is good in that respect, the saving remedy of Truth heals, from whomsoever it comes.*

And the same Person, reckoning up the Innovations of the Third Age; mentions amongst the rest *Cyprian's* corrupt Idea of the Church, thereby opening a Door to the most cruel Doctrine that ever was advanced; of which he thus speaks: "He made a false Idea of the Unity of the Church, which he encloses in one external Communion, and because the Unity of one visible Head was not yet invented, he imagined I know not what Unity of Episcopacy, which all the Bishops did individually possess; whereof nevertheless each administered but a part. This inconsistent Imagination, gave place

“ place afterwards for the substitution of one single Head, to the end, that  
 “ a visible Head might be given to the Unity of the visible Communion,  
 “ which might be the Center thereof. — The Bishop of *Meaux* brags much  
 “ of four or five Passages in *St. Cyprian*, that ancient Doctor goes so far as to  
 “ say, [*There can be no Martyr but in the Church, that when a Man is sepa-*  
 “ *rated from its Unity, 'tis in vain that he sheds his Blood for the Confession of*  
 “ *Jesus Christ.*] This Maxim in a large signification may be suffered, for  
 “ indeed there may be Hereticks, who confessing the Name of Jesus Christ,  
 “ but on the other side, ruining the Foundations of the Christian Religion,  
 “ may die for the Religion of Jesus Christ to no advantage. But the Appli-  
 “ cation which *St. Cyprian* makes thereof, is one of those Faults, over which  
 “ wise Men ought to draw a Curtain; he proceeds so far as to apply it to  
 “ the *Novatians*. Now it must be known, that the *Novatians* were good  
 “ Christians, a thousand times better than the Papists, since they did not  
 “ ruine any of the Foundations, but retained and believed all the Christian  
 “ Verities, only they were something severe in Discipline, and would not  
 “ receive those that fell in times of Persecution to the Peace of the Church;  
 “ was not this a fine occasion to say as *Cyprian* did, That a *Novatian* was no  
 “ Christian? — O what temper are the Doctors of the Roman Church,  
 “ that make use of those Excesses which ought to be hid out of honour to  
 “ those Great Men that fell into them? It was *Cyprian's* Zeal, for the Peace  
 “ of the Church and the Hatred he had for Schism, that ran him into that  
 “ Excess, as to think or say, That out of I do not know what Exterior Unity  
 “ of the Church a Man could not be saved; and it was in this Age that Men  
 “ begun to corrupt the Idea of the Church. P. 150, 151.

I have transcribed thus much, out of the Letters of this Illustrious Divine,  
 because some, noted Men amongst us, lay much stress upon the Authority of  
*Cyprian*, in this Notion of One Communion, and One Episcopacy; though  
 they can make bold to censure him themselves, in the case of Rebaptizing,  
 and the Peoples Duty of withdrawing from the Communion of a Debauched  
 Bishop, in which he is very Positive; and I know not why they should deny  
 us that Liberty they take themselves. Ep. 68. Ed.  
*Gualteri*,  
 P. 201.

But it may be, the Opinion of an Eminent Divine of the Church, would  
 go further with some People than either Scripture, or Fathers, or foreign  
 Authors: And is it not the common sense of that Church that has so often  
 told the World, there is none upon Earth so Learned and Wise as her self;  
 that without the Unity of Episcopacy, there can be no true Church, no Sa-  
 craments, no Salvation? I confess, her Chieftains have been free enough of  
 such kind of Language, when it has been her Glory to tread upon the  
 Necks of poor Dissenters; but when the Tables were turned, and she had  
 to do with an Adversary that could make as great a Noise about Ca-  
 tholick Unity and Communion as her self, she learned more Modesty and  
 Discretion.

Though they all acquitted themselves well, in their late *Rencontres* with the Papists; yet I know none that have come off more cleverly, than the Examiners of *Bellarmino's* Notes of the Church; Upon the seventh Note, P. 164, 165. [*the Union of the Members amongst themselves*] We have this Account of Church-Unity.

" There is the Unity of submitting to One Head, the Lord Jesus; There is the Unity of Professing the Common Faith that was once delivered to the Saints; There is a Unity of Sacraments; a Unity of Obedience to all the Laws and Institutions of Christ, the Union of Christian Affection and Brotherly Kindness: The Unity of Discipline and Government, by retaining for substance the same Form that was left in the Church by the Apostles, an Unity of Communion in the Worship and Service of God, — Now to speak clearly, there ought to be all these Kinds and Instances of Unity in the Church, but we see evidently they are not all there; I mean in every part and Member of the Church, and therefore they are not all necessary to the being of a Church, but some of them are; and they are, The Acknowledgment of One Lord, the Profession of One Faith, and Admission into the state of Christian Duties and Privileges by One Baptism: And this is all that I can find absolutely necessary to the Being of a Church.

And if they be the same Persons that Vindicate the Discourse of the Notes, *Vindic. p. 20,* they speak yet plainer thus: " In such a divided state of Christendom as this is, meer External Unity and Communion cannot be the mark of a true Church — All true Christian Churches are United in the most Essential things; They have *one Hope, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God* and the Father of all; and this makes them one Body, animated by the same Holy Spirit, which dwells in the whole Christian Church; but still they are not One entire Communion, but divide and separate from each other; this we will grant is a very great Fault, but yet if they Communicate in such things as make one Church, their Quarrels and Divisions may hurt themselves, but cannot destroy the Unity of the Church, for the Church is one Body not meerly by the Agreement of Christians among themselves, but by the Institution of Christ, who has made all those that profess the same Faith, and are united in the same Sacraments, to belong to the same Body, to be his own Body: And therefore Christians are never Exhorted to be One Body, for that they are, if they be Christians, as the Apostle expressly asserts; but they are exhorted to live in Unity and Concord, because they are One Body, *Eph. 4. 1, 2, 3.*

*Ephes. 4. 5, 6.*

And in the 25th Page, " Those who profess the true Faith of Christ without any corrupt Mixtures, are Sound and Orthodox Churches; other Churches are more or less pure, according to the various Corruptions of their Faith; And thus it is with respect to the Christian Sacraments and Worship too.

I hope this will be acknowledged very pertinent to our purpose, but if we desire

desire it, he will yet speak more plainly, for when his Adversary had said [Succession of Doctrine, without Succession of Office, is a poor Plea.] He answers, "I must needs tell him, it is a much better Plea than Succession of Doctrine; for I am sure, there is not a safe Communion where there is not a Succession of Apostolical Doctrine; but whether the want of a Succession of Bishops will in all Cases unchurch, admits of a greater Dispute: I am sure true Faith in Christ, with a true Gospel Conversation, will save Men: and some Learned Romanists defend the old Definition of the Church, that it is *Ceterum Fidelium*, the Company of the Faithful; and will not admit Bishops or Pastors into the definition of a Church. P. 53.

I have e'en tired my self with these Quotations, not for the sake of our Cause, but out of Civility to the Citizen of *Chester*, and Men of his Temper, that by taking up a false Idea of Catholick Unity, to the Exclusion of all those that have not Diocesan Episcopacy, are animated by it, to the greatest Severities against them, concluding that those who shut themselves out of the Catholick Church, are well enough served if they be cast out of Civil Society, and denied the common Rights and Privileges of Mankind.

Let us now examine this Gentleman's Notions about the Unity of the Church, which may give us a little diversion in our Journey; He charges the Vindicator, with mis-reporting his Description of Unity, omitting that which was necessary to be added; and if he did so, he was very much to blame: But let us turn to the places, and try whether it be so or no. Rep. p. 16.

Those words out of which we must draw his Notion of Unity are these, "Though there be a Multiplication of Churches by the encrease of Believers, yet no variation; they are all one with that Church first mentioned in *Jerusalem*, and all One with one another, being all United into one Spiritual Society or Body, under One head Jesus Christ, and are in all things the same with that first Church; United in One Baptism and in One Faith, all partake at the same Table—— and so all United in the visible external Worship and Service of God. This Account of the Unity of the Church, the *Vindic.* thus Contracts, "All Churches are One, as United into One Body; whereof Christ is the Head, having the same Baptism, the same Faith, and the same Eucharist. Now what has he omitted, that belonged to his Description of Unity? why he should have added, They are all One with that Church first mentioned at *Jerusalem*, but that he left out; and he should have added, They are all one with one another: and again, They are in all things the same with that first Church, but he omitted both these. A very dangerous Omission! But pray, what do all these three Sentences amount to, more than this single Assertion, the Catholick Church is One? Not one of them answers the Question wherein it is One, it is no explanation of the Unity of the Church, to say it is all One with the Primitive Church; and all One with it self, and the same with that first Church; still the Question is, wherein is the Church One? wherein does the Unity of all true Churches consist? For to say they are One, because they are One, and because they

are

are the same, and all One with one another, is a most vain and ridiculous Tautology, which the Vindicator was so civil as to pass by, only fixing upon those words that tell us wherein they are One, even as united into One Body, under One Head, having the same Baptism, Faith and Eucharist, and so united in the Worship of God; the other Phrases barely assert the Unity, these describe and explain it; But this Gentleman knows not when he is well dealt with, but will force us to expose him whether we will or no.

The Vindicator having thus Collected out of his words, a description of Unity, as consisting in the same Lord, and in the same Baptism, Faith and Eucharist, agrees to it with this Explanation, [*that is the same for Substance*] for it does not appear that they all agreed in the Primitive Times in the same Circumstances; and infers from hence that there may be Catholick Unity, without Diocesan Episcopacy and Ceremonies; neither of which he put into his Description.

The Gentleman's reply to this is very remarkable, for thus it goes; "It is plain, all that he drives at here is, that there may be a true Church-Unity without Episcopacy, which Doctrine is a meer Innovation, &c. But why did he not then insert the Unity of Episcopacy in his Description? If he left it out, it was not to be expected the Vindication should foist it in for him, as he now would do himself, but it is too late, and to add it now, is not a Defence of his former Paper, but an Amendment rather, such as it is, but indeed rejected by the most Judicious of the Episcopal Writers, as has been already evinced; to which I will here add one citation more; that I may either recover him out of his frenzy, or leave him inexcusable; 'tis the Learned Author of *The Summary of the late Controversies betwixt the Church of England and the Church of Rome*.

P. 123.

He very well distinguishes between External Ecclesiastical Communion and the Unity of the Church; and says, "The Unity of the Catholick Church consists in One Faith, and Worship and Charity; that indeed such external Communion when occasion offers, shews that we are all Disciples of the same common Lord and Saviour, and own each other for Brethren. But the Church may be the One Body of Christ without being One Ecclesiastical Body, under One Governing Head, which 'tis impossible the whole Christian Church should be; and therefore a Church that divides it self from that Ecclesiastical Body, to which it did once belong, if it have just and necessary Reasons for what it does, is wholly blameless, nay commendable for it, if it have not, it sins according to the Nature and Aggravation of the Crime; but still may be a Member of the Catholick Church, and still enjoy all the Privileges of the Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, and Promises of Everlasting Life; which shews how the Holy Catholick Church in the Creed may be One; Notwithstanding all those Divisions of Christendom, which are caused by the Quarrels of Bishops, and Disputes about Ecclesiastical Canons and Jurisdiction.

Thus



Thus have these Learned and Sober Gentlemen, made up those defects, which the Lord Verulam complained of in his day, he sits down amongst the Deficients, and recommends us a wholesome and profitable work, a Treatise touching his degrees of Unity in the City of God: and he tells us, "It exceedingly imports the Peace of the Church, to define what, and of what Latitude those points are, which disincorporate Men from the Body of the Church, and cast them out, and quite Cast their brethren from the Communion and Fellowship of the Faithful. The bounds of Christian Community are set down, one Faith, one Baptism, and not one Rite, one Opinion, the Coat of our Saviour was entire without Seam, but the Garment of the Church was of divers Colours: In the mean time, it is very likely he that makes mention of Peace, shall receive that answer *Jesus* gave to the Messengers, Is it Peace *Jesus*? What hast thou to do with Peace? Turn and follow me: Peace is not the matter, that many seek after, but parties and siding.

To conclude this point, since the Unity of the Church consists in the true Catholick Faith and Christian Affection, whereby Men are knit to Christ the Head, and to one another; None are out of the Unity of the Church, but those that are destitute of these fundamental Graces, and to affirm this of Protestant Dissenters in general, is a piece of Diabolism which the Gospel abhors, and Humanity it self will be ashamed of. We must first prove that Men are without Faith, before we can prove that they are without the Church, and not (with the Papists) condemn them as void of Faith, because out of the external Communion of their Church. It is a very foolish and misleading method, to prove our interest in the Faith, by our interest in the Church, as if we must first know the true Church, and that we are in it, before we can know the true Faith or that it is in us: this way of arguing has been always condemned by Protestant Writers. The Scripture Test for the trial of our Faith, is a serious endeavour to perfect Holiness in the fear of God, to be careful to maintain good works, &c. And indeed nothing but gross Heresie and known constant Immoralities, can warrant us, in saying, that any who profess to be Christians are destitute of the Faith: and whether Dissenters in *England*, do not generally shew as much of the fear of God, both in their Families and common Conversation as their Neighbours, must be left to the Consciences of all observing Men here, and the righteous judgment of God hereafter.

And I hope they may modestly justify their pretensions to Christian Love and Charity too; I am sure their quiet and peaceable behaviour under so many years severe Persecution, will plead more strongly for them, than for those by whom they suffered such things; all the World will take notice, how unable those Gentlemen were to bear a very small share of those Severities themselves, which they had for a long time so liberally inflicted upon others.

I am far from the thoughts of charging these things upon the Episcopal Party

*Dr. Stillingfleet, Trinit. p. 121.* God will one day convince men that the Union of the Church lies more in the Unity of Faith and Affection, than in the Uniformity of doubtful Rites and Ceremonies.

Party in general, or even the Clergy themselves; but all the Nation will bear witness, 'tis too true concerning those Bishops and others that were formerly most uneasy and troublesome to their Dissenting Brethren.

How odd a thing was it, for this Gentleman to begin his Book, with Panegyricks upon Peace, when the avowed design is to justify all those Violations thereof, that have been the scandal of the Protestant Religion. He tells us of a blessed Legacy left us by our dying Redeemer, and why then should we not be suffered to enjoy it? I am sure we should have been glad to have lived in the obscurest places and circumstances, where we might have enjoyed that Sacred Bequest; but there were a Generation of Men amongst us, who having spent their own Legacies, would needs deprive us of ours, unless we would surrender the dearer Peace of our own minds. I am afraid it is the conscientiousness of their former guilt, that makes many of them, so very suspicious and jealous of Dissenters as they are; they can hardly believe that we have any Charity for them, because they know how little they have discovered towards us: And thus the remembrance of what is past, pushes them on to farther abuses, instead of producing fruits meet for Repentance; whereas I do verily believe the generality of Dissenters can heartily forgive all that's past, and would be glad to see any ground of hope that the same men would not greedily embrace the first opportunity of acting over again their former excesses.

## CHAP. II.

*Of Obedience to our Governours, Spiritual and Civil. That the Jurisdiction of our English Bishops is not Jure Divino; but Presbyters have as much Power by the Law of God as they. An Answer to the Gentleman's Allegations out of Antiquity. The Judgment of the Fathers, and Councils, and School-men, and our first Reformers, and the Divines of the Transmarine Churches.*

**I** Hope we have safely passed the Ordeal of Catholick Unity; we now proceed to defend our selves, from the dreadful Accusation of Disobedience to Superiors; for though our Non-Conformity should not utterly exclude us from the Unity and Communion of the Catholick Church, yet if it involve us in the guilt of Sedition, contempt of our Lawful Governour, and disobedience to their just Commands, our Cause would be bad enough, and we could by no means justify it before God or the World.

The Indictment charges upon us a twofold Disobedience; First, Disobedience to our Spiritual Governours the Bishops; And secondly, To the Civil Magistrate likewise; but we do verily believe our selves to be innocent, and desire